



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-011
Wednesday
17 January 1990

Daily Report Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-011

CONTENTS

17 January 1990

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

2 Days of Troop Withdrawal Talks Held in Prague	1
Talks Open at Cernin Palace [Prague Radio]	1
Talks Conclude 16 Jan [TASS]	1
Agreement Reported on Withdrawal From Hungary [Budapest Radio]	1
Grinevskiy Interviewed on CFE Talks [IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]	1
Arms Reduction Possibilities for 1990 Outlined [NEW TIMES No 1]	2
Chervov Interviewed on Vienna Military Seminar [Moscow Radio]	3
Karpov on Anniversary of Gorbachev Statement [Moscow Radio]	4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Official Reviews Warsaw Pact Command Structure [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jan]	5
---	---

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 16 Jan Briefing	6
Vienna Arms Talks	6
'Anti-Albanian Campaign' Denied	6
Kurile Islands Policy	6
Statement by Israeli Premier	6
New Arab League Mission	6
French Agreement, El Salvador	7
Perez de Cuellar Continues Visit to Moscow	7
Meets With Gorbachev [Moscow International]	7
Further on Gorbachev Meeting [PRAVDA 17 Jan]	7
Sees Improved Political Climate [TASS]	8
Border Procedures Undergo Simplification [Moscow TV]	9
Shevardnadze Comments on Ties With EEC, NATO [NEW TIMES No 1]	9
EEC Envisages Closer Ties With Eastern Europe [PRAVDA 14 Jan]	13
World Reactions to Gorbachev Lithuania Visit [PRAVDA 16 Jan]	13
Rogachev Holds Talks in Paris on Cambodia [TASS]	14
Foreign Ministry Official on Vienna Talks [TASS]	14
'Observers Roundtable' Views CEMA, Arms Talks [Vednyapin, Andrianov, and Kolchanov on Moscow Radio]	15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Reports on 'Neutralized' U.S. Agent [14 Jan]	17
U.S. Argument Over 'Peace Dividend' Previewed [Gan in PRAVDA 16 Jan]	19
Bush Administration Reviews Afghan Policy	20
Possible Motives Examined [PRAVDA 13 Jan]	20
Could Mean Arms Embargo [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jan]	20

China

Jiang Zemin Cited on Need for Political Unity [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Jan]	21
Aviation Cooperation with PRC Reviewed [Moscow International]	21
Technology Company Official Views Cooperation [Moscow International]	22
Technological Cooperation Ties Surveyed [Moscow International]	22
RSFSR Commercial Official Comments on Trade [Moscow International]	23

Amity Society Leader Cites 1989 Contacts [Moscow International]	23
Northeast Asia	
Japanese Foreign Minister Continues Visit	24
Abe, Lukyanov Reach Accord on Ties [Tokyo KYODO]	24
Abe Leaves for Home [Tokyo KYODO]	24
Japanese Politician Welcomes Dialogue [TASS]	24
Sakhalin Historian on Outlook for Kurile Islands [Moscow TV]	24
ROK Effort To Ease Cocom Restrictions Noted [Moscow International]	25
Agreement Signed for ROK Joint Venture Plant [Moscow International]	25
Economic Ties With ROK Enhance Area Security [Moscow International]	25
Imports From ROK Rise by Over 400 Percent [IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]	26
Hyundai Group Opens Company in Nakhodka [Moscow International]	27
'Winds of Change' on Korean Peninsula Discussed [(Petrov) on Moscow International]	27
Positive Signs Mark Recent ROK, DPRK Moves [Moscow International]	27
Scale-Down of "Team Spirit" Exercise Viewed [Moscow International]	28
Cultural Centers Pact Signed With DPRK [PRAVDA 12 Jan]	28
Southeast Asia & Pacific	
UN Security Council Holds Talks on Cambodia	29
Background to Meeting Noted [Moscow International]	29
Rogachev Participates [TASS]	29
Efforts To Settle Cambodia Conflict Viewed [IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]	30
Svay Rieng Accords Welcomed [PRAVDA 14 Jan]	31
Philippine Economic Situation Surveyed [Aleksandrov on Moscow International]	31
Pre-election Developments in Burma Described [Nikolayev on Moscow International]	32
Near East & South Asia	
Iranian Delegation Leaves Following Visa Talks [TASS]	33
Vorontsov Briefs Envoys on Azerbaijan Situation [Tehran Radio]	33
Soviet Mideast Stance Reiterated on Talks Eve [Zlatorunskiy on Moscow International]	33
Arab League Chief Welcomes Moscow Proposal [TASS]	34
PLO Welcome for Moscow Mission Upgrade Noted [PRAVDA 14 Jan]	34
'Arafat Cables Gorbachev [TASS]	34
More on 'Arafat Message [Moscow International]	34
Sharayev Heads CPSU Delegation Visiting Syria [TASS]	35
Meets With Ba'th Official [PRAVDA 14 Jan]	35
Delegation Returns Home [PRAVDA 16 Jan]	35
10-Year Trade Protocol Signed With Egypt [TASS]	35
'Idiosyncratic' Al-Qadhdhafi Ideas Noted [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jan]	36
Afghanistan Urges West To Reopen Embassies [TASS]	37
Afghan Envoy on Success of Reconciliation Policy [TASS]	37
Najibullah Blames War on Foreign Interference [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jan]	38
Time 'Working in Favor' of Kabul Government [PRAVDA 12 Jan]	38
Vorontsov, Pakistani Envoy Discuss Afghanistan [TASS]	39
East Europe	
CPSU's Yakovlev Meets GDR's Willerding [PRAVDA 17 Jan]	39
GDR Premier Notes Importance of USSR Trade [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jan]	39
GDR People's Chamber Debates Reported [IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]	40
SFRY Vice Premier Arrives for Mixed Committee [Belgrade TANJUG]	41
Ryzhkov, Silayev Receive Mitrovic [TASS]	41
'Social Tension' Seen Over Hungarian Price Hikes [PRAVDA 10 Jan]	41
Risky Polish Economic Experiment Viewed [IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]	42
Moldavian Delegation Leaves for Romania [TASS]	43
Daily Describes Moldavian Aid to Romania [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 30 Dec]	43

NSF Leaders Deny Anti-Ceausescu Coup Planned	44
Ceausescu Terror Precluded Coup [IZVESTIYA 11 Jan]	44
Brucan on Revolution [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 2]	46
Roots of Deposed Ceausescu Regime Examined [TRUD 10 Jan]	47
Anticommunist Mood of Bucharest Rally Cited [PRAVDA 14 Jan]	49

West Europe

Gorbachev's March Visit to Spain Uncertain [Madrid Radio]	50
CPSU Delegation Completes Talks in Spain [PRAVDA 16 Jan]	51
Further on Estonia's Vyalyas Visit to Finland [TASS]	51
Soviet-Finnish Cooperation Commissions Meet [TASS]	51
FRG's Kohl Remarks on Unification, USSR Ties [PRAVDA 12 Jan]	52
View of GDR 'Dangerous Delusion' [IZVESTIYA 12 Jan]	53
Genscher on 'Central Importance' of USSR Ties [PRAVDA 16 Jan]	54
Soviet-French Meeting Discusses Human Rights [PRAVDA 12 Jan]	54
Right Wing Trying to 'Eliminate' French CP [PRAVDA 12 Jan]	54
Greek Pressure on Albania Follows Romania Events [IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]	55
USSR's Abalkin Cited on Confidence in Leaders [Hilversum International]	55

Latin America & Caribbean

Khachaturov Comments on U.S. Panama 'Aggression' [Radio Peace and Progress]	55
Relations Established With Antigua, Barbuda [Moscow TV]	56
Broadcasting Agreement Signed With Ecuador [TASS]	56

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Meets 16 Jan	57
Discusses Baltic Laws [PRAVDA 17 Jan]	57
Gorbachev Chairs Session [TASS]	58
Supreme Soviet Committees Resume Work [Moscow Radio]	58
Ecology, Architecture Open Round [IZVESTIYA 11 Jan]	59
Land Law Discussion [TASS]	60
Supreme Soviet 3d Session Decreed To Open 14 Feb [TASS]	60

Political & Social

Gorbachev Chairs CPSU CC Russian Bureau 15 Jan [TASS]	60
Situation 'Extremely Tense' in Azerbaijan, Armenia [IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]	61
Baku Death Toll Exceeds 40 [Moscow Radio]	62
Foreign Ministry Says 40-50 Killed [AFP]	63
Official Toll Set at 56 [TASS]	63
Yerevan Reaction to Clashes Described [Moscow Radio]	63
Emergency Decree's Effects in NKAO [Moscow TV]	64
Order Being Maintained [Moscow TV]	65
Principal Measures Described [Moscow TV]	66
Azerbaijan Leader Supports Emergency Decree [Baku Radio]	66
Internal Affairs Ministry Briefing on Disturbances [Moscow Radio]	67
Baku Situation Still 'Extremely Complex' [IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]	67
Armenians Evacuation Continues [TASS]	68
3300 Armenians Depart 15 Jan [Baku Radio]	69
Yerevan Delivery of Arms to NKAO Reported [Baku Radio]	69
Primakov, Girenko, Vezirov Hold Talks in Baku [Moscow TV]	69
Give News Conference [Baku Radio]	70
Vezirov Discusses Azerbaijan's 'Sovereign' Rights [Baku Radio]	70
Baku Popular Front Organizes Brigades [Baku Radio]	70
Baku Workers Demand Public Order [Baku Radio]	70
Baku Deputies Condemn Armenian Decision [Baku Radio]	70
Azeri Papers View NKAO Organization Committee [Baku Radio]	71

Azeris Accuse Armenia of 'Declaring War' [Kuwait KUNA]	71
Armenian Claims Against Azerbaijan Refuted [Mamedov on Baku Radio]	71
Azerbaijan State of Emergency Viewed [IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]	72
Lenkoran People's Front Statement on Takeover [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Jan]	73
More Troops To Be Sent to Armenia [Yerevan Radio]	73
Curfew Imposed in Azerbaijan Localities [Yerevan Radio]	73
Armenian Leadership Holds Extraordinary Meeting [Yerevan International]	74
Communications Link Discussed [Yerevan Radio]	74
11-13 Jan Armenian Supreme Soviet Session [ARMENPRES]	74
Slyunkov Meets Armenian Intellectuals, Departs [Yerevan Radio]	75
USSR Envoy Briefs Va'ezzi on Azerbaijan Events [Tehran IRNA]	75
Soviet Azeris Continue to Cross Border 16 Jan [Tehran IRNA]	75
More Than 30 Cross [Tehran IRNA]	76
More Reportage on Gorbachev Speeches in Lithuania	76
11 Jan Speech to Fuel Workers [PRAVDA 13 Jan]	76
11 Jan Address to Intelligentsia [Moscow TV]	82
Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Holds News Conference	89
Party 'Destiny' Viewed [Moscow Radio]	89
'Future Activities' of Party Members [Vilnius International]	89
13 Jan Meeting of Lithuanian Communist Aktiv	90
Brazauskas Opening Remarks [PRAVDA 15 Jan]	90
Text of Gorbachev Speech [PRAVDA 15 Jan]	90
Brazauskas Speech [PRAVDA 15 Jan]	99
Burokyavichyus Address [PRAVDA 15 Jan]	102
'Sigma' Worker's Comments [PRAVDA 15 Jan]	104
Gorbachev Addresses Baltic Commanders 13 Jan [TASS]	104
Gorbachev's Remarks on Lithuanian Stay Cited	105
'Not Spent in Vain' [TASS]	105
'Stability Will Be Preserved' [IZVESTIYA 13 Jan]	106
Cautions Against 'Rally-Type Passions' [TASS]	106
'Useful' Visit [Moscow International]	107
Lithuanian Official Views Gorbachev Visit [Moscow International]	107
Significance of Gorbachev Lithuania Trip Viewed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Jan]	108
Possible Lithuanian Secession Discussed	109
Would Need Referendum [IZVESTIYA 12 Jan]	109
'Blow to Political Reform' [TASS]	111
Sajudis Rejects Secession Law Initiative [Vilnius International]	112
Sajudis Official Comments [Vienna DER STANDARD 13-14 Jan]	112
Brazauskas Comments on Talks With Gorbachev	112
Visit Clarified Positions [Vilnius International]	112
Views 'Political Lesson' [TASS]	113
Medvedev Holds Press Conference in Vilnius [Moscow TV]	113
Vilnius Radio Blasts Gerasimov Remarks on Lithuania [Vilnius International]	115
Lithuanian Press Official on Access to Gorbachev [Vilnius Radio]	115
Radio Carries Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session	116
0900 GMT 15 Jan [Vilnius Radio]	116
1017 GMT	117
1056 GMT	118
1300 GMT	118
1340 GMT	118
1449 GMT	119
Brazauskas Election Shows Party Winning Trust [Moscow International]	120
Astrauskas Resigns as Lithuanian Parliament Head [Vilnius Radio]	120
Delegates Discuss Future of Lithuanian SSR, Party [SOVETSKAYA LITVA 21 Dec]	120
Comparison—PRAVDA on Gorbachev-CPLi Meeting [13 Jan]	130

Economic

Panel Discusses Unemployment, Wage Indexing [IZVESTIYA 6 Jan]	130
Switch to Convertible Currency Assessed [TRUD 3 Jan]	131
Leningrad Institute Taps Foreign Expertise [IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]	132

Scientific

Ulyanovsk Radar To Be Moved for Health Reasons	[Moscow International]	133
Nuclear Power Station Incident Figures for Dec	[IZVESTIYA 12 Jan]	133
Cosmonauts Mark 130 Days Aboard Mir	[TASS]	134
Mortars Used for Seismic Experiments	[PRAVDA 11 Jan]	135

Military

Moscow MD Communists Draft Election Platform	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jan]	135
--	--------------------------------	-----

2 Days of Troop Withdrawal Talks Held in Prague

Talks Open at Cernin Palace

LD1501142790 Prague Domestic Service in Czech
1400 GMT 15 Jan 90

[Text] Czechoslovak-Soviet talks on the withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Czechoslovakia opened in Cernin Palace in Prague today. The delegations are led by Evgen Vacek and Ivan Aboymov, deputy foreign ministers of the two countries.

Talks Conclude 16 Jan

LD1601214790 Moscow TASS in English 2138 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Prague January 16 TASS—The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia ended the first two days of talks on Soviet military presence in Czechoslovakia here on Tuesday.

The talks were led by Deputy Foreign Ministers Ivan Aboimov of the Soviet Union and Eugen Vacek of Czechoslovakia.

The first round of talks consisted of preliminary discussions on political, military, legal, financial and other aspects of Soviet presence in the country.

The sides had a constructive exchange of views, including on the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Czechoslovakia had presented a timetable for a phased withdrawal, as well as a proposal on the status of the Soviet troops during the pull-out.

The sides agreed to resume talks in Moscow by the first week of February at the latest.

Agreement Reported on Withdrawal From Hungary

LD1301120290 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1130 GMT 13 Jan 90

[Text] Hungary and the Soviet Union believe that there is no need, from any standpoint, for the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. Thus, they have agreed that the units in question will be withdrawn as soon as possible. Miklos Nemeth gave the news to two Japanese papers after his talks in Sofia with Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Speaking about CEMA, he said that transforming the organization will take a long time. At the same time, he indicated that Hungary wishes to create a separate group within CEMA with Czechoslovakia and Poland, which are at the same level of development.

Grinevskiy Interviewed on CFE Talks

PM1601105790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with O.A. Grinevskiy, ambassador at large and head of the Soviet delegation at the Conventional

Forces in Europe (CFE) arms reduction talks in Vienna, by own correspondent S. Tosunyan: "Decisions Awaited at the Hofburg: The Next Round of the Vienna Talks Has Begun"]

[Text] Vienna—The halls of the Hofburg Palace put at the disposal of the participants in the talks on conventional armed forces and confidence- and security-building measures in Europe were empty during the Christmas and New Year holidays. The delegations interrupted their work for 3 weeks and went home. But talk concerning the problems of European security under discussion at the Hofburg did not stop.

In particular, concern has been expressed that the headlong changes taking place on the continent could introduce additional difficulties to the Vienna talks. Critical voices also have been heard claiming that the talks are failing to keep up with the course of events and are being held in isolation from the new European realities and the new political situation on the continent.

How justified are these misgivings? I put this question to Ambassador at Large O.A. Grinevskiy, leader of the Soviet delegation at the talks, on the eve of the new round.

"The events on the continent give no grounds for concern over the fate of the talks," the ambassador said. "The processes of renewal taking place in the countries of Eastern Europe and the diversity of the means of economic and social reform chosen by those countries are combined with their common deep interest in the successful completion of the talks. Regarding the claims that the pace of the talks lags behind the pace of political change, there is a grain of truth here. What we have here is a desire to artificially 'maintain a distance' between the positions of the two groups of states and hush up proposals which could lead to a solution of the most complex problems. For example, despite our Western colleagues' acknowledgment that the East's proposal on the scope of the cuts in tactical aviation is a step toward a compromise, they have failed to produce an answer to this proposal so far. It seems that rather than seeking ways to bring the positions closer together they prefer to sideline the topic and recall it less and less.

"If the Western partners consider this normal, it makes you think that they are governed by some kind of talks timetable of their own which is distinct from that planned by our countries' leaders. Recently the topic of troop personnel cuts has virtually disappeared from discussion. Our questions concerning the Western allies' troops located outside the boundaries of national territories in Europe have been left hanging in mid-air. You get the impression that our colleagues are losing interest in the important areas that are the subject of the talks.

"It is taking an agonizingly long time to solve the question of formulating definitions of combat tanks and combat armored vehicles. The NATO countries' delegations have spent almost three rounds of the talks pondering the fate of the very large fleet of light tanks. And

this occurred despite the fact that the priority of the topic of reducing armoured vehicles has been repeatedly expressed.

"The level of 14,000 units for combat infantry vehicles and heavily armed combat vehicles set in the so-called new 'expanded category' of combat armored vehicles does not alleviate our concern regarding NATO's one-sided approach to the problem of cutting armored vehicles. Such a level, on the one hand, gives the West the opportunity to build up light tanks and, on the other, demands the destruction of most of the Warsaw Pact countries' combat infantry vehicles.

"I would like to hope that in the course of the new round the sides will be able to hold serious discussion of the categories of armored vehicles and complete the formulation of definitions.

"The agenda for the fifth round under way is unprecedentedly busy and intense. We have to focus attention on the major issues which our partners have of late preferred to sidestep. I am thinking primarily here of the problems of aircraft and personnel. As soon as it is recognized that these problems are the most complex, discussion of them must be started as quickly as possible.

"It is time to complete the work on other definitions too. Opportunities for this do exist. For example, this can be done quickly for tanks, armored vehicles, and helicopters. The numerical parameters of the forthcoming cuts remain unagreed and the lists have not been specified. We want to propose to the NATO countries that work in this area be completed by the end of the round.

"Work on the text of the treaty and accompanying documents must be gotten fully under way at the current session. The two drafts of the treaty submitted have much in common. Nor are there any great divergences in the material which is to form the basis for the treaty protocols. I am thinking, in particular, here of a key document such as the the protocol on the exchange of information and on verification. Its elaboration could be started up at full speed without any delay at all.

"Interest in the Soviet Union's proposal on holding a kind of all-European summit meeting at the end of this year has been mounting sharply of late in Eastern and Western political circles. The prospects of such a meeting are becoming increasingly realistic since the need to hold it is being dictated by life itself. One of the items on the agenda for this meeting could be the signing of a treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe. Such a step would form an organic part of the changes under way, and it would be unforgivable to miss the chance of opportunely complementing political detente in Europe with military detente."

Arms Reduction Possibilities for 1990 Outlined

PM1601144390 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No 1, 1990 pp 24-25

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Aleksey Arbatov in "What Will the New Year Bring?" feature: "New Military Thinking in East and West"]

[Text] To predict the course of disarmament for a year and especially for ten years ahead is more difficult than to forecast weather, though even reports are not always accurate. Being essentially a political process, disarmament depends on numerous attendant factors that have no direct bearing on the matter. Moreover, success in disarmament often depends on Soviet state's policy which in its turn must be a subject of research. In other words, by predicting the course of disarmament we forecast our own activity, a vital component of the process.

Disarmament for 1990 could be prognosticated most easily by a study of minimum and maximum programmes in this field. The minimum programme envisages agreements that are likely to be concluded unless unforeseen circumstances arise. These include the first treaty on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, a treaty on halving the strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States, a convention on chemical weapons, a treaty on diminishing the yield of nuclear tests and, most likely, the first treaty on the reduction of armed forces on the Sino-Soviet border.

Certainly such relapses to the policies of strength as the U.S. intervention in Panama could aggravate the military and political detente.

The maximum programme could include a second treaty on halving the strategic offensive weapons (to 30 or 25 per cent of their present level), an agreement on limiting space experiments and strengthening the ABM Treaty, an agreement on more drastic cuts in the conventional armaments of the North Atlantic and Warsaw Treaty blocs (plus the regearing of their military potentials to defense needs and the reduction of foreign troops in Central Europe to a minimum), and an agreement on limiting the tactical nuclear weapons in Europe to the "minimal deterrence" level.

The conclusion of several more accords can be expected in the near future: on diminishing the yield of nuclear tests to a minimum with the fixing of a low annual quota on ceasing the production of fissible nuclear material, prolonging the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (with accompanying measures to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and the accession of more countries to the treaty), on limiting military supplies, especially of missiles and missile technology, and on reducing the level of Sino-Soviet military confrontation to a minimum. Lastly, we can hope that agreements will be reached on the regulation of naval activity, the reduction of large naval fleets, and the abolition of certain naval

armaments—nuclear means in particular—in addition to strategic ballistic missiles.

The list could be continued. The "bracket" forecast of disarmament is very deceptive, however. It created the illusion that the maximum programme, just as the minimum programme, can be achieved simply by more energetic efforts in the same direction. That is not so. Progress in carrying out the maximum programme calls for radical qualitative changes in the policies of both East and West.

Let's take, for instance, cuts in strategic armaments below the 50 per cent level. They cannot be effected merely by a further reduction of strategic carriers and nuclear warheads. Such cuts will require a drastic limitation or ban of highly effective weapons systems capable of undermining stability at a lower level of the nuclear balance. This presupposes an agreement on principles of stability, that is, transition for mutual cuts to a virtually joint regulation of the strategic balance and direction of intensive military technological progress into nondestabilizing channels. In the first place it applies to space programmes and "defence" forces and weapons—anti-missile, anti-aircraft and anti-submarine.

Or take another example. A more substantial reduction and a reform of the armed forces in Europe will make necessary a cardinal reorganization of the existing blocs and a fundamentally new collective security system on the continent. The current political and economic changes in Europe are to be integrated into a new system which should guarantee, on the basis of reciprocity and political interests of all countries, the Soviet Union and the United States included.

The aim now is not only to apply new political thinking but also to develop new military thinking in accordance with which the armed forces of countries, formerly opposed to each other, would become mutually complementary and controllable elements of the overall structure of military stability and prevention of armed conflicts. It will not be the same world, only with reduced military arsenals, but a qualitatively new international relations setup.

We could express many wishes to the West with a view to carrying out such qualitative changes. But, first of all, we should not forget about ourselves. The successes of our foreign policy, in particular in disarmament, are beyond doubt. However, they have been made possible to a great extent thanks only to the energetic efforts of top political leaders and a conscientious fulfilment of decisions adopted by them, and to the determination to shuffle off departmental prejudices in our country and stereotypes in the West. For the purpose of consolidating and promoting our foreign policy successes it is urgently necessary to institutionalize new political thinking by overhauling the decision-making system.

This means that openness and democratic principles should be used in the working out of foreign and military

policies at the junction of which positions on disarmament issues are formed. Decisions on the strategy and military programmes and approaches to a limitation and reduction of armaments should be considered on an alternative basis in a democratic way by drawing on the whole spectrum of non-departmental views.

The Supreme Soviet, the academic world, the media and the knowledgeable sections of the public are to play a great part in this respect. These reserves of the democratic process are not yet used fully. Especially disappointing is the work of the Supreme Soviet's committee on defence and state security, which now resembles a secret branch of the defence ministry and the military industry rather than a parliamentary forum for the working out of national security policy democratically. Certainly no one puts into question the personal integrity and competence of the committee's members. One can only wonder if supervision can be effective if it is carried out by the officers of the same department. It is not for nothing that the principle of the devision of powers exists... taking an example from a fairy tale—it's like "a fox guarding a hen-house," in fact, a relapse to the administrative system.

The army is not the domain of generals and chief designers, though some of them find it hard to understand this truth, brushing away the views expressed by "outsiders." It is maintained on public money diverted from vital social needs and the people, through their deputies, have the right to define the limits of defence sufficiency. Disarmament treaties directly concern the people. The formulation of their trend and their final assessment are a constitutional function of a competent and independent parliament. The internal restructuring of the decision-making system as part of our social, economic and political reforms is the only guarantee of making the disarmament process irreversible and maximizing its achievements in the coming decades.

Chervov Interviewed on Vienna Military Seminar

LD1501233290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 15 Jan 90

[Text] News agencies are giving attention to a seminar on military doctrines which opens in Vienna tomorrow. Taking part will be the chiefs of the general staffs of the member-countries of the all-European process.

All-Union Radio Commentator Vladimir Pasko asked Colonel-General Chervov, head of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and a member of the Soviet delegation, to talk in detail about the aims and tasks of this seminar and how they are perceived in our country.

[Begin recording] [Pasko] Nikolay Fedorovich, it seems to me that untying the question of doctrines would make it possible to continue all the talks on disarmament which are now being conducted as well as begin new ones, including talks on tactical nuclear weapons and sea armaments. This seminar is simply unique.

[Chervov] Indeed, never in history have such highly placed military representatives as the chiefs of the general staffs of the armed forces of 35 states gathered together at the same table to discuss military doctrines, reflecting in a concentrated form the problems of war and peace. It is a major military and political measure from the viewpoint of strengthening confidence measures; that is first and foremost.

Second, a lot of obstructions have built up, a lot of vagueness and misunderstandings between states in the military sphere. Many suspicions still persist with regard to military activity. The chiefs of the general staffs will have to speak frankly about all of these questions, remove the suspicion and the lack of confidence which still exists in the military sphere. Of course, I fully agree with you, and this is the third factor that you mentioned: Naturally, the seminar has to create a favorable background. At any rate, that is what I am counting on and hoping for—for conducting all talks on disarmament, primarily the Vienna talks of the 23 and the 35 states. Certainly the problems of the Vienna seminars include naval forces, nuclear weapons, and chemical weapons. The discussion of these problems at the Vienna seminar will help to start talks on naval forces, on tactical nuclear weapons, including the implementation of the proposal we put to the United States and NATO countries at the Malta meeting. Mikhail Sergeyevich put forward the proposal to Bush on eliminating tactical nuclear weapons at sea. [end recording]

The seminar opening in Vienna is certainly unique and I would like to draw your attention, comrades, to the political side of this event, for the very fact that the chiefs of the general staffs, other military representatives, diplomats, and scientists of 25 [as heard] countries are meeting shows that not just political relations between countries but military ones, too, are entering a qualitatively new stage. The essence of this lies in the fact that it is what unites peoples and states rather than what divides them that is moving into the forefront of international politics.

Karpov on Anniversary of Gorbachev Statement *LD1501222190*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1145 GMT on 15 January carries a 14-minute program entitled "Into the Third Millennium Without Nuclear Weapons," presented by correspondent Vladimir Pasko. The program marks the fourth anniversary of Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement proposing a nuclear-free world.

Noting the West's initial suspicion of this proposal, Pasko summarizes the subsequent course of events.

He then introduces Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov as one well qualified to talk about progress over the past 4 years, the current situation, and what can be expected in the future.

Karpov begins by saying that although the principal aim of the 1986 program was to eliminate U.S.-Soviet confrontation, it embraced conventional and chemical weapons as well as nuclear armaments, "and in these 4 years something already has been done through the efforts of the Soviet leadership and Soviet diplomacy to implement this program." The main achievement is the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Karpov outlines the Soviet stance and proposals, noting that "We are not just proposing to abolish nuclear weapons and leave conventional weapons. We are simultaneously proposing a reduction in conventional weapons, too. There is already a serious discussion about this in Vienna, where very serious shifts toward the conclusion of an agreement have taken shape. We can fully count on an accord on deep cuts in conventional weapons being achieved as early as this year. There is also a possibility of concluding, as soon as this year or next year, a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons."

Perestroika of international relations on a new basis is taking place at the same time as these arms reductions, Karpov stresses, saying that although the conventional and strategic arms talks have not yet come to an end, the very fact that they are taking place is changing attitudes and "even, I would say, ideas about what the relations between, say, NATO and the Warsaw Pact should be based on." In the transition from confrontation to cooperation, Karpov says, "the tasks, in addition to the reduction of conventional weapons is, I would say, one of remaking [peredel] the alliances, or of lending them a new nature, from military to political alliances—alliances which could, in uniting the countries of East and West Europe respectively, serve as an instrument for cooperation, and later for constructing a common European home. Such a task is a realistic one."

The program is being adopted by everyone at a de facto level, Karpov claims, and "this represents an additional incentive for those issues which were set as tasks in 1986 to now become issues to be resolved today, tomorrow, and the day after."

Pasko concludes by stating that the current trends in international relations make it possible, to a great extent, that "the world will be able to enter the third millennium without nuclear weapons."

Official Reviews Warsaw Pact Command Structure

*PM1601155590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 14 Jan 90 First Edition p 3*

[Interview with Colonel General V.N. Verevkin-Rakhalskiy, first deputy chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, by unnamed correspondent under the headline "Guaranteeing Security"; date and place not given]

[Text] [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Profound democratic changes are taking place in the Warsaw Pact countries. How are they affecting the activity of the Joint Armed Forces Staff?

[Verevkin-Rakhalskiy] First and foremost, I would like to note that changes have embraced the armed forces in the allied republics too. They consist of the practical implementation of tenets and of coalition and national military doctrines which, as is well known, have an unequivocally defensive orientation.

A great deal has been done in the past year. The Warsaw Pact states have substantially reduced their armed forces and weapons. Organizational, staff, and structural changes have been made with a view to giving the troop groupings a strictly defensive character. Operational and combat training underwent substantial adjustments.

The process of perestroika has its own specific nature and tempo in each allied army. This, naturally, demands that the Joint Armed Forces Staff constantly keeps its finger on the pulse of the troops' life, and it demands great efficiency and dynamism in work, a more critical evaluation of it, and an examination of the forms and methods of activity, involving the rejection of those that do not prove effective in the new conditions.

It is all the more necessary to stress that the Joint Armed Forces Staff today has a greater responsibility for guaranteeing the full implementation of the tenets of the Warsaw Pact states' military doctrine. Its activity is designed to promote the maintenance of the Joint Armed Forces' combat readiness at a level guaranteeing that any aggression will be repelled.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Our readers ask in their letters: What do the Joint Armed Forces embody? What formations and units do they include?

[Verevkin-Rakhalskiy] The allied countries' Joint Armed Forces include the forces and resources intended for joint action, and joint military organs formed under Article 5 of the Warsaw Treaty.

Each state designates specific contingents of its troops and naval forces for the Joint Armed Forces. Their numbers and composition, as well as organization and equipment in hardware and weapons, are fixed by each country's government in accordance with its particular economic and military potential.

The troops and naval forces assigned to the Joint Armed Forces remain under the authority of the national defense ministries. Their life and activity is regulated by the laws, theses, and military regulations that exist in each state.

The Joint Armed Forces include formations and units from the land forces, air defense forces, air forces, and navies. The joint military organs include the Joint Command, the Military Council, the Staff, and the Technical Committee. General questions relating to the strengthening of the Joint Armed Forces' defense capability and organization are examined by the Political Consultative Committee, while a Defense Ministers' Committee has been formed to elaborate appropriate recommendations and proposals as well as questions to be examined by the Political Consultative Committee.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Are there any specific principles for forming the Joint Armed Forces Staff as regards all the member states' representation on it?

[Verevkin-Rakhalskiy] The Joint Armed Forces Staff is made up of generals, admirals, and officers of all the allied states' armies according to the principle of proportional representation. They are all released from their other responsibilities in their armies.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Our newspaper has already touched on the question of the procedure for appointing a Joint Armed Forces commander in chief, which was followed by interested phone calls to the editorial office. Could you clarify how military leaders are appointed to leading Joint Armed Forces posts?

[Verevkin-Rakhalskiy] Let me remind you that the Joint Armed Forces commander in chief is appointed by the decision of the Warsaw Pact governments from among the military leaders of any of the pact states. The nomination put forward for this post is examined by each allied country's government and is only ratified if there is a consensus. The Joint Armed Forces commander in chief is guided in his actions by decisions made by allied countries' governments and by Political Consultative Committee instructions. The commander in chief has the right to present for examination by the allied countries' governments candidates for Joint Armed Forces chief of staff and first deputy commander in chief as well as some other deputy commanders in chief, who are then appointed by these governments. Furthermore, in coordination with the defense ministers he can appoint his own representatives to the Warsaw Pact armies and approve, within the numerical limits laid down, the personnel of the Staff, the Technical Committee, and other organs of the Joint Armed Forces administration. He can also establish, in coordination with the defense ministers, the procedure for generals', admirals', and officers' service in the Joint Armed Forces administration organs and issue orders for their appointment to the posts.

TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 16 Jan Briefing**Vienna Arms Talks***LD1601145890 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the Vienna seminar on military doctrines, which opened today, should discuss all their aspects, including military-political and military-technical issues related not only to conventional armed forces, but also to nuclear weapons and naval forces, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The seminar was convened in line with the agreement reached at the Vienna talks of those countries that participated in the conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

"The USSR believes that holding the seminar is in itself an important military-political measure to strengthen trust.

"It will facilitate the removal of mutual mistrust and create conditions for the development of the participants' military-political blocs on strictly defensive principles," the Soviet spokesman said.

'Anti-Albanian Campaign' Denied*LD1601154790 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—"The Soviet Union does not participate in any anti-Albanian campaign," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He commented on a statement by the Albanian ambassador to Italy who accused the USSR, Yugoslavia and the United States of launching such a campaign. The spokesman strongly doubted the very existence of such a campaign.

Gerasimov also refuted an allegation that the "Albanian question was discussed at the Soviet-American summit off Malta."

The spokesman stressed that the Soviet Union favours the development of relations with Albania, which is corroborated by the Soviet press which invites in its materials to develop relations between the two countries.

Kurile Islands Policy*LD1601175190 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—"The Soviet stance regarding the Kurile Islands is well-known—the borders should remain as they are." This was how Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov responded at a press briefing here today. When asked by a foreign correspondent if there were changes in the Soviet point

of view on this issue after the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met Shintaro Abe, a member of the Japanese parliament leading a delegation from the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party on a visit to Moscow.

The Soviet spokesman said the development of relations between the two countries was obstructed by Japan's stance regarding four islands of the Kurile chain.

"Consultations concerning this issue are being held with the Japanese side," Gerasimov stressed. "This issue should not block the development of Soviet-Japanese relations."

Statement by Israeli Premier*LD1601145590 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—The Soviet Union which resolutely condemned the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, also condemns the Israeli policy of establishing settlements of immigrants there, no matter from where they come, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He commented on a statement made by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir in Tel Aviv on Monday. The essence of the statement was that Israel intends to hold the occupied Arab territories and plans to settle immigrants there from other countries, above all from the USSR.

"The statement by the Israeli Cabinet head inflicts a serious blow on peaceful efforts in the Middle East and is not to the benefit of Israel," the spokesman said.

New Arab League Mission*LD1601154290 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—A senior Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman announced today that Munsif al-May, head of the League of Arab States' [LAS] representative office, will arrive in Moscow on January 17. "The opening of the LAS mission in the Soviet capital is an important step in the development of Soviet-Arab relations," Gennadiy Gerasimov said.

Gerasimov stressed that the USSR respects the high international authority of this regional organisation, its vigorous involvement in the quest for ways to resolve conflict situations in the Middle East and its role in coordinating Arab countries' positions on the Middle Eastern settlement.

"In our conviction, with the establishment of the LAS mission in Moscow, political interaction between the USSR and Arab countries will acquire a broader and more businesslike nature," Gerasimov noted. "The experience of former contacts shows that there is a sound basis for this interaction, which is meant to bring lasting peace and stability to the Middle East."

In the Soviet Union they also expect the mission's activities to stimulate the development of Soviet-Arab cooperation in the economy, science, technology and culture and to boost ties between people in the USSR and the Arab states," Gerasimov said.

French Agreement, El Salvador

LD1601183690 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Moscow January 16 TASS—Munsif al-May, head of the Mission of the League of Arab States in Moscow, arrives here tomorrow, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today. He said that with the setting up of the Mission of the League of Arab States in Moscow, political interaction with Arab countries will assume a broader businesslike character.

The spokesman announced that a Soviet-French inter-governmental agreement on economic, industrial, scientific and technological cooperation was signed in Paris on Monday. He said the agreement envisages the setting up of a mixed inter-governmental Soviet-French commission. [passage omitted]

The USSR expects a seminar on military doctrines that opened in Vienna today to discuss all their aspects, including questions of military policy and technology as regards not only conventional forces, but also nuclear weapons and the navy, the spokesman said.

Soviet observers believe the pause in the efforts towards the settlement of the crisis situation in Central America, connected above all with the U.S. invasion of Panama, is about to end.

This is how Gerasimov assessed reports that the Salvadoran Government headed by Alfredo Cristiani and representatives of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front announced the intention to open consultations with the United Nations secretary-general about his mediation in the talks on the settlement of the situation in El Salvador. The Soviet Union approves the fact that the election campaign proceeds normally in Nicaragua, he said. At the same time the spokesman noted that the peace process in Central America encounters serious difficulties that should be removed. In this connection he pointed to the need for the earliest possible withdrawal of U.S. occupation troops from Panama.

Answering questions about the situation in Soviet Transcaucasia, Gerasimov said that in accordance with the decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the introduction of the state of emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region and some other districts, the Soviet Foreign Ministry was instructed to conclude the negotiations on border regulations shortly and to inform adjacent countries of the decree.

He mentioned the number of casualties in Transcaucasia, saying that according to reports more than 40 people died there. [passage omitted]

Perez de Cuellar Continues Visit to Moscow

Meets With Gorbachev

LD1601174690 Moscow World Service in English
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev has met in Moscow with the United Nations secretary-general, Perez de Cuellar. The head of the international community arrived in Moscow to take part in a global forum for environment and development for survival that opened in the Soviet capital on Monday [15 January].

On the same day Mr Perez de Cuellar met with the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze. The two men paid special attention to the growing UN role in the fast changing international situation. They noted conditions were laid for the United Nations to turn into a strategic center to promote international peace, cooperation, and stability.

Mr Perez de Cuellar pointed out that in the new decade the international community had to concentrate on the problems the whole of humanity is facing, and on building up its peace-promoting role.

Further on Gorbachev Meeting

PM1701122590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jan 90 p 1

["M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With J. Perez de Cuellar"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev met UN Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar in the Kremlin 16 January. It was a meeting between people who are well informed about each other's activities, who highly appraise each other's activities, and who intuitively understand each other on a human and political level.

The meeting coincides with a critical moment in perestroika's development. Naturally, therefore, this topic came to occupy a prominent place during the conversation. Both participants voiced confidence in the progress of perestroika and that it will steadily build its potential, despite difficulties, contradictions, and very acute problems.

M.S. Gorbachev assured the UN secretary-general of the Soviet Union's invariable and resolute support for this universal, worldwide organization which the world community particularly needs in our time. He emphasized Perez de Cuellar's contribution to restoring the UN's prestige and its practical possibilities, as well as his contribution to organizing the regular activities of the Security Council and its five permanent members, the role of which, in their view, should continue to grow in the future. M.S. Gorbachev noted that support for the

UN flows naturally from the new thinking policy, the constructive potential of which is only just beginning to grow in strength as the internal perestroika progresses and as its positions within the country grows stronger. M.S. Gorbachev expressed the hope that the UN, representing the world community, would, in turn, be in solidarity with and support perestroika in the USSR. He said it is important not only for us, but for everyone, for the world as a whole.

The conversation touched on problems of a further settlement in Namibia, which the UN secretary-general considers one of his most important tasks in the forthcoming period, and he is above all counting on the great powers' participation.

They exchanged views on the Afghanistan situation. It was noted that it is groundless to bank on a military solution. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate with the UN, the United States, and other states to promote the setting up of negotiations among all the opposed sides in Afghanistan, with the possibility of going on to an international conference in which Afghanistan's neighbors and other interested states could participate.

Matters connected with Eastern Europe events were touched upon in the context of the pan-European process, and the importance of further improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and interaction were noted. The year 1990 must produce serious changes here and become a year of important decisions and accords.

Agreement to hold a special session of the foreign ministers of the five permanent Security Council members for a businesslike examination of ways to solve highly important problems of the contemporary world, in connection with the 45th anniversary of the formation of the UN, was expressed.

Perez de Cuellar recalled the head of the Soviet state's speech at the UN General Assembly a year ago. It was an expression of enormous support for that organization, and its special significance was the ideas and principles proclaimed there. M.S. Gorbachev gave assurances that the Soviet leadership intends to consistently and steadfastly implement what was said at that time before the whole world, not only in its external activity, but in its domestic work as well.

M.S. Gorbachev congratulated Perez de Cuellar on his birthday, which will be marked in a few days, and wished him all the best for many years.

E.A. Shevardnadze and V. Dayal, the UN secretary-general's cabinet chief, participated in the meeting.

Sees Improved Political Climate

*LD1601202190 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—The political climate in the world has improved remarkably of late. U.N.

Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar said this in his speech at the diplomatic academy of the Soviet Foreign Ministry today.

He noted the need for support to current positive processes which can end the era of confrontation and put a stop to the arms race.

The U.N. secretary-general said that he had a conversation with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today.

On behalf of the United Nations he thanked Gorbachev for the Soviet Union's support for the efforts of the world community to resolve political, economic and social problems in the world today.

Perez de Cuellar also said that the development of world politics was discussed during the conversation and that special attention was given to the Afghan problem.

He said that he assured Gorbachev that the United Nations continued to do its utmost to settle that conflict. There was also a discussion of the ways of consolidating the United Nations' role in safeguarding world peace and security.

Regarding the problems that hamper the establishment of an equitable world order, Perez de Cuellar singled out the question of the violation of human rights. He said human rights violations are among the most important reasons for the continuation of many conflicts.

The U.N. secretary-general said there is a need to press for the elimination of disproportions in the economies of the north and south. Not only the future of developing countries but also long-term interests of industrialised countries and the world economy as a whole depend on the solution of this problem.

He believes conditions have been created for a businesslike discussion of the indebtedness of developing countries and the speeding up of their development.

Perez de Cuellar believes the aggravated ecological crisis indicates that unless more funds are invested in the economy of developing countries, there might be a global catastrophe.

He also noted the need for multilateral efforts to combat illegal trafficking of narcotics and related international crime and terrorism. Large funds are thus deflected from development purposes.

Regarding the role of the law in international relations, the U.N. secretary-general said that all disputed problems should be decided by the international court in The Hague. He declared in favor of the setting up a special foundation from which developing countries could draw to repay court expenses.

Perez de Cuellar deplored the United States' decision to use military force in Panama and emphasised that this runs counter to the United Nations Charter.

Border Procedures Undergo Simplification

LD1601205490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] I would call our diplomats' two latest actions—actions which concern procedures on the Soviet state boundaries, a specific manifestation of the new political thinking.

First, as you recall, during the meeting, the recent meeting in Bucharest, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze came to an agreement with Romanian Foreign Minister Celac. The agreement concerned the fact that the time had come to simplify mutual journeys and the border exchange of Soviet and Romanian citizens. Now, the draft of the new agreement regulating these procedures is being handed over to the Romanian side at our Bucharest embassy. I am sure our Moldavian comrades, the Moldavian population of the border region, will be pleased to find out about this.

The procedure for crossing the Soviet-Iranian state border is also being simplified. Talks on this have taken place with an Iranian delegation in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A draft agreement on a simplified border crossing procedure for our two countries' citizens who permanently reside in border regions has been elaborated and handed over to the Iranian side.

Shevardnadze Comments on Ties With EEC, NATO

PM1201155390 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No 1, 1990 pp 20-22

[Special correspondent Galina Sidorova report datelined Brussels-London-Moscow, incorporating interview with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, under the rubric "Common European Home": "A Two-Day Long Interview. A conversation with the Foreign Minister with Digressions, Reflections, and Impressions"; date not given]

[Text] Nobody came to see us off. This was the first surprise. Not one of the nation's leading bureaucrats left the affairs of the state to line up for a few minutes on the runway. The Hammer and Sickle alone was flapping on its post in a remote corner of the airfield indicating that a leader was leaving.

That was how Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's last visit in 1989 started. He was heading for Belgium to sign the first Agreement on Trade and Commercial and Economic Cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the European Economic Community and the Euratom [European Atomic Energy Community], to pay the first visit to the NATO headquarters, to meet foreign ministers from 12 countries, to negotiate with the Belgian leadership and then to fly over to London for a brief meeting with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. All in two days.

Foreign political breakthroughs have been a routine business of late. Perhaps, because each time such breakthroughs become only a prelude to even greater events.

The lunch, so uncharacteristically tasty to be served aboard an Aeroflot plane, was the only thing that reminded one this was an official flight. Officials from the Foreign Ministry secretariat and various departments were busy introducing the last corrections to the documents and texts of speeches, translating them on the spot. Only security guards relaxed before the tough mission that awaited them in Brussels.

Shortly before the landing, when the side wind started rocking the plane Shevardnadze came up to the handful of Soviet journalists who accompanied him on his visit. Trying to keep balance in the aisle, we spoke of the forthcoming Soviet contacts in European institutions. Actually, my interview with the foreign minister started in these last few minutes before landing and continued throughout the two days of the visit.

The first question came naturally:

NEW TIMES. "We are flying to NATO and the EEC. Does this mean that the cold war is over?"

Eduard Shevardnadze. "The cold war is over. We are at the beginning of a peaceful period of European development. But this is also a period of changes and it can prove quite turbulent. In this connection I am alarmed by the indications of political extremism, the danger of destabilization and disrespectful attitudes to the realities...."

The interconnection of stability and changes was the main topic of the Soviet foreign minister's numerous meetings with colleagues in London and Brussels.

The Soviet-Belgian talks became the prelude to the signing of the agreement with the European Communities. Soviet-Belgian relations don't know acute contradictions. That must be why the attention was mostly paid to pan-European affairs. When asked about the difficulties he saw in the future, Belgium's Foreign Minister Eyskens stressed that the Belgian Government attached great importance to stability against the backdrop of democratic reforms in Eastern Europe. "If we want to maintain stability," said he, "we shouldn't be in a hurry. It is necessary for the East and the West to strengthen mutual confidence."

Brussels, they say, is a very beautiful city. Unfortunately, I couldn't make sure of it myself.

Suddenly I realized that when one sees the diverse world mostly from behind the bullet-proof windows of armoured limousines or official residences, one starts feeling detached from the places one visits and develops a feeling that the world is but a large village. That's the lot of all today's statesmen. Later I regretted not asking Shevardnadze about this. But then there was no time for

lyrical digressions. The working day ended around midnight only to be replaced by the preparation for the after working day which started around 6 a.m.

When I looked through the text of the agreement I realized at once that it differed from other economic agreements with Western partners which used to be concluded before. First, it differed in the number of signatories. Second, I recalled the heated debates which took place a year ago in Vienna around the "economic basket" of the Vienna accords. Initially, Soviet representatives were trying to learn as much as possible about others without saying anything about this country. Later this practice had to be rejected. And now I was reading the concrete implementation of the Vienna concept of more openness in economy and trade: "The sides agree to publish comprehensive statistics on commercial and financial matters including those of production, consumption and foreign trade."

Predictably, such data will not be an inspiration for our Western partners. But the publication of these statistics will promote more trust between us which means that our partners will be more willing to make compromises and seek most effective ways of cooperation. The agreement stipulates cooperation in all spheres: industry, agriculture (including the food industry), power engineering (including nuclear), nuclear research, in the sphere of rational use of mineral resources, environmental protection, raw materials, mining industries, economic, monetary, banking, insurance and other services, standardization, management, personnel training and statistics.

The Soviet Union and the European Community grant each other "the most favoured nation" treatment. The European Communities pledged to gradually abolish quantitative import restrictions applied to the U.S.S.R. and in its turn, the Soviet Union, in the Special Statement annexed to the agreement, pledged, with the account taken of the provisions of the final act, concluding documents in the Helsinki framework and in the context of the economic reform presently under way in this country, to improve working conditions for businessmen of the Communities in the U.S.S.R. on the non-discriminatory basis, to concentrate issue of import licences in one competent state body and not to encourage barter deals. A Mixed Commission was set up comprising Soviet representatives and representatives of the EEC.

Roland Dumas, France's Foreign Minister said the sides made a speedy progress in preparing the conclusion of this agreement. Difficulties, however, were bound to arise stemming from different structures and even traditions. We are members of different pacts. Mr Dumas noted that mentality and orientation were to be changed.

NT. Comrade Shevardnadze, what do you think is the main significance of the agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Communities?"

E.Sh. "It won't be an exaggeration to call this agreement a breakthrough. We have resolved issues of fundamental importance. This is a framework agreement which opens up prospects for mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities. We are removing many obstacles which have for many decades impeded normal trade and providing conditions for common European economic space, further rapprochement between the Soviet Union and West European countries and solution of many urgent problems of Europe. We can gain much. Europe will develop a reliable market. Hence—mutual interest and mutual profit."

NT. "And still things are not as smooth and festive as at the signing ceremony?"

E.Sh. "There are problems. We are restructuring slowly. We will have to adjust to European and world standards. Many Soviet economic managers are going abroad to acquaint themselves with the experience of neighbours and potential partners but the effect is hardly noticeable yet. To cooperate seriously with all European institutions, we need high professionalism, and adequate personnel training."

NT. "Did you discuss the problem of Cocom with your European colleagues?"

E.Sh. "We touched upon it in our talks with the Belgian leaders, with Mr Delors and with the ministers. Tendencies seem to have appeared recently which make us hopeful. Responsible statements have been made that Cocom restrictions should be eased. But these are only the very first steps. If it were up to me, I would vote for abolition of Cocom. But this decision is up to our Western partners. Mostly, to the U.S. The remaining discriminatory measures contradict the interests of the U.S.S.R., East European countries and Western Europe because they limit possibilities of cooperation."

NT. "What did you mean by the common European economic space?"

E.Sh. "Integration of our economies—economies of the West and the East, including the Soviet economy. Actually this process is already developing, which is attested to by the signing of the current Agreement between the Soviet Union and the Economic Communities. We are making the very first steps, of course, towards, integration of the East and the West. These are the most difficult steps. If this process continues intensively, at a certain stage we will be able to speak of common European economic space."

"Today we must establish dialogue between the existing European structures - political and economic alike. We could set up a trilateral commission for Europe attended by the three largest associations - CMEA, EEC and EFTA [European Free Trade Association]. If we really want bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and other East European states on the one side and the European communities on the other, we can't ignore the

existence of such a large economic organization as the CMEA. In principle, the question is solved already—the Common Market and the CMEA maintain bilateral relations. But it's time we moved farther. As for the CMEA, a radical reform will be needed there. We have arrived at the understanding with our partners on the speedy reconstruction of the CMEA."

Breakthrough to NATO

Journalists, especially my Western colleagues were tormented by the question of who invited whom, as Minister Shevardnadze's meeting with Manfred Woerner, NATO's Secretary-General approached. At a press conference Eduard Shevardnadze said that he hadn't asked to be accepted, but had raised the question whether a meeting with Manfred Woerner could be expedient. All questions disappeared, however, after the Soviet minister entered the NATO headquarters in Brussels. This was the second and the main surprise of the visit. Eduard Shevardnadze was making his way towards the lifts through the large lobby filled with NATO officials who burst into applause as soon as the Soviet minister appeared.

Domestic sceptics and conservatives may again try the old argument: "If the enemy applauds you, see where you were wrong." The argument is illogical by itself. Soviet politicians aren't lauded in NATO. They are recognized as partners in European and world affairs. Our new policy is recognized and respected in NATO circles, although some aspects of it evokes disagreement.

The years of the cold war were a lesson for NATO too. Despite a range of different opinions of the current situation in East-West relations, no one at the bloc's political headquarters wants a new confrontation.

NT. "What did you discuss with Secretary-General Woerner and permanent representatives of the 16 NATO member-countries?"

E.Sh.. "First of all, the decision to meet the Soviet minister was taken in NATO collectively after consulting all ministers. We discussed a wide range of issues including prospects of reductions of armed forces and armaments. We agreed that there were good chances to conclude the Vienna talks in 1990 and reach a convention banning chemical weapons. The secretary-general shared our view that the work to conclude the START Treaty could soon be over. I think, there are reasons to believe that we shall start negotiating reductions in the tactical nuclear arsenals. We stressed the usefulness of the discussion of military doctrines which is opening in Vienna."

NT. "Could NATO and Warsaw Treaty cooperate in the spheres other than that of arms control?"

E.Sh. "If the quantity and level of armaments are limited to the requirements of sufficiency for defence, then this could be a reason for us to speak about a lesser military component and stronger political aspects in the two

military-political alliances. We in the Warsaw Treaty and NATO are pondering on the ways to reconfigure the two blocs along political lines. We believe that the Warsaw Treaty and NATO can play an important stabilizing role at the given crucial stage of the European process."

NT. "Weren't your meetings in NATO a surprise for the Soviet military department?"

E.Sh. "No. We have complete mutual understanding with the Ministry of Defence on this and other matters. We prepare the stance at the talks jointly."

NT. "When is Mr. Woerner coming to Moscow?"

E.Sh. "I didn't invite him formally, but said at the end of our meeting: 'Perhaps we meet in Moscow now?' It seemed to me he wasn't opposed to the idea. The question of his arrival is a different business. Our relations will go on developing."

The Soviet Factor

Eduard Shevardnadze was showered with question when he appeared at the Political Commission of the European Parliament. First of all the parliamentarians were interested in the U.S.S.R.'s attitude to the processes under way in Eastern Europe and the Soviet vision of tomorrow's Europe at large.

NT. "At your meetings in NATO and the Political Commission of the European Parliament you spoke of Helsinki-2, of an all-European conference in 1990...."

E.Sh. "We suggested that such a conference be convened at the level of heads of state. First, it is needed to sign the accords on conventional armaments. Second, the Soviet side believes that the question of the current political and economic situation in Europe is bound to arise at a summit meeting of the 35 states. There would be speeches and proposals on the so-called German question. It is difficult today to forecast the conclusions. I don't think answers will be found in five or six months or in a year. Nonetheless, it would be useful to discuss all these things...."

NT. "What are the main doubts of our Western partners, then?"

E.Sh. "Some doubt the consequences of such a meeting for Europe. Which documents will be adopted? I believe the best we could do is to prepare a communique. Other, more fundamental documents, can't be worked out in so short a time. The ministers are worried over the content of this communique and the way it will reflect the processes and problems of today's Europe. And not Europe alone. I believe it is necessary to set up multilateral bodies, committees or centres of the CSCE for coordination of fresh ideas and proposals. Later, such centres could develop consultative functions. We have agreed with the ministers to continue contacts on the working level, to determine the agenda and the character for the document which could be adopted at the nearest

all-European meeting, if such a meeting takes place at all. I for one believe it is necessary and must be held."

NT. "In the context of current and future changes, how do you see the basis of stability and do your views coincide with the impressions of your Western colleagues?"

E.Sh. "They do coincide vastly. I felt it during the meetings with the ministers and the dialogue with the Belgian leadership. Everybody is concerned in the positive sense of the word, over the rapid changes in Eastern Europe and everybody wants to preserve stability. The community of interests is fertile soil for cooperation in this complicated business. There isn't and will never be ideal stability. I think the current situation is not bad as far as stability is concerned. It allows development of internal processes in all countries and of integration processes on the all-European scale."

N.T. "When we talked in Vienna you spoke of the common European home whose economic, political, military and humanitarian walls were being built simultaneously. Which wall is being built faster?"

E.Sh. "I wouldn't like to make such comparisons. There is progress in all spheres. The prominent tendency today is that of overcoming the military confrontation. It is based on the confidence-building measures after the Stockholm conference. If the talks in Vienna are a success, then we shall feel an entirely different atmosphere in Europe, see new prospects for further progress in reductions of armed forces and armaments. Similar tendencies have been observed in economy and ecology as well."

NT. "Is there anything that alarms you in the European political situation?"

E.Sh. "The current political situation doesn't cause any serious concern. In a sense I am worried about tomorrow. I have already said that extremist forces can enter the political arena at crucial turning points of history. This is very serious and topical for the West and Eastern Europe. That is why all the ministers spoke in favour of creating conditions for normal evolution of democratization, especially in Eastern Europe."

NT. "On the eve of the Malta summit I spoke in Washington to some American politicians and politologists. My American interlocutors compared the economic situation in Eastern Europe with the stability which appeared after WWI ended. They were concerned whether the current difficulties could breed serious tensions."

E.Sh. "I am not alarmed by the economic situation in most of our allied countries. The economic situation in Poland is very serious indeed and this can't but cause concern. The Poles are searching for a solution. It is not easy to find optimal ways to normalize the situation. We have cooperated with Poland and we will do so in the future. The West is rendering assistance to it. I can't say

whether this is enough—the processes under way in Poland are too controversial. But we are greatly interested in the situation being normalized."

NT. "Don't you fear for the Soviet economy?"

E.Sh. "I am an optimist. Besides, I sincerely believe that we have managed to achieve much in these four years. I categorically disagree with the scientists who believe we are approaching a catastrophe. In my opinion, we have laid the groundwork on which to renew the economic mechanism. Three or four years were spent to work out and adopt laws. Today, I think, we have all the necessary structures, institutions and laws to start the drive for a healthier economy. I think the government programme is optimal. There couldn't be any other in the circumstances. We must progress steadily, but step by step. The state deficit is today 120 billion rubles. In 1990 we plan to reduce it by half. This is a sober calculation and not just figures. In general, when in Brussels, we spent much time discussing our problems with the ministers. I did most of the talking."

NT. "So this is what worries you most?"

E.Sh. "Everybody understands what the Soviet factor means for Europe and the world. Everybody understands that any destabilization in this country can trigger unpredictable consequences."

The lady of the mansion in 10 Downing Street was most touching when she ran her fingers over decorations of the tall Christmas tree. In a few minutes she was to receive the Soviet foreign minister. The "Soviet factor" reigned supreme that evening at the old British mansion where portraits of great premiers painted by great artists stare coldly from the walls. During the talks Margaret Thatcher as usual paid special attention to perestroika in the U.S.S.R. In London Shevardnadze heard good words about our country just as he did earlier in Brussels.

The Western enthusiasm is not incidental. Turbulent changes in the U.S.S.R. which inspired even more radical reforms in East European countries made the Soviet factor the epicentre of the world politics. A paradox happened: on the one hand, these changes confused some Western politicians who had grown accustomed to the cold war-vintage stability, on the other hand, they facilitated the European stability of the future based on the shared European principles. The East and the West are equally interested in such stability as Shevardnadze's meetings confirmed.

Vastly the success of the Soviet policy is determined by its more realistic vision of the world, especially in the most recent time. At last Moscow recognized the fact that Europe, although divided to blocs and military alliances, is today the most integrated region in the world. On recognizing this, we placed our castle-in-the-air concept of the common European home on the stable foundation of the existing experienced European institutions and started to cooperate with them.

How will we benefit from the policy based on deideologization of relations with the West and some socialist countries too of which Shevardnadze spoke at the Political Commission?

Our foreign policy is pulling this country into the civilized world acting as a guarantee of the reformation of socialism.

EEC Envisages Closer Ties With Eastern Europe

PM1601141390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Peresada dispatch: "Advantage Is Mutual. East and West: Prospects for Cooperation"]

[Text] Brussels, 13 Jan—The EC member countries are planning to considerably broaden their economic ties with the states of Eastern Europe. The EC Commission has drawn up a schedule for increasing its ties in the very near future.

It is above all a question of relations between the EC and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the GDR, and Romania, since accords on multifaceted cooperation with Hungary and Poland are already being implemented and an agreement signed recently with the Soviet Union—the most important of them—will soon enter into force.

What are the specific plans? To revise the current commodity exchange agreement with Czechoslovakia, extending it to the sphere of economic cooperation, including transfer of technology and removal of any quantitative restrictions. To hold—possibly this month—the final round of talks with a view to signing a similar document with Bulgaria. To complete talks of this kind within 3 months with the GDR, bearing in mind that a future agreement will not affect the provisions of an accord on bilateral trade between the GDR and the FRG.

Lastly, Romania. After the fall of the Ceausescu regime, people at EC headquarters believe opportunities have opened up for including this country in the system of active relations with the Common Market. It is envisaged that a major cooperation agreement may be drafted this year.

EC leadership bodies are guided in their intentions not only by their political evaluation of the situation and experts' recommendations but also by public opinion. The "Eurobarometer" bulletin published by the commission reports that, according to data from sociological studies, 78 percent of those polled in the EC member countries advocate closer economic ties with East European states, welcoming the current changes in these states.

World Reactions to Gorbachev Lithuania Visit

PM1601103990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jan 90 Second Edition pp 1,7

[TASS roundup, dated 15 January, of international reaction to Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania under the heading "Dialogue Must Be Continued; Responses to M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Lithuania"; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The results of the visit to Lithuania by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, continue to be one of the main topics of the foreign mass media. Foreign observers are in agreement that far-reaching processes of reinterpreting the entire life of the Soviet people over the past decades are now taking place in Lithuania. The newspapers give detailed accounts of M.S. Gorbachev's speeches in Lithuania, citing his arguments in support of preserving the Soviet Union, only in a renewed form, instead of "dispersing among national apartments." The foreign press has given various assessments of the results of the discussions in Lithuania.

London: THE SUNDAY TIMES expressed the opinion that M.S. Gorbachev's trip was successful because it "provided evidence that the Lithuanians are prepared to discuss and debate the question of independence rather than recklessly proclaiming it." Analyzing the problems the Baltic republic might find itself up against if it were to hastily break away from the USSR, the newspaper writes: "On this cold, wintry day, you feel chilled just thinking about how a republic with a population of 3 million would exist in total isolation from the Soviet Union."

Gorbachev must be hoping for the same kind of outcome as in the Canadian province of Quebec, where, after establishing the right to hold a referendum on secession, the French separatists stepped back from the brink, an editorial article in the THE GUARDIAN said.

The Lithuanians have been impressed by M.S. Gorbachev's political abilities and his commitment to reform, THE TIMES stated.

Washington: "Whether M.S. Gorbachev's mission, whose aim was to slow down Lithuania's movement toward independence, was successful or not will only become clear in the coming months," THE NEW YORK TIMES' Moscow correspondent wrote.

"Despite the uncertainty of the results, Gorbachev's masterly efforts in Lithuania confirm his reputation as the leading Soviet representative and the only person in the Kremlin who has powerful political potential and a broad vision of the Soviet Union's future," an editorial article in THE WASHINGTON POST said.

The press has published an account of a press conference given by Leo Cherne, director of the Research Institute of America, which for the last 55 years has been involved in forecasting the political and economic development of

various countries in the world. He said, in particular: "To be perfectly honest, an independent Lithuania—just like an independent Latvia—would come up against incredible difficulties, perhaps even insurmountable difficulties, if it wants to create a sovereign state."

"The Bush administration is torn between two opposite poles," ABC Television said. "On the one hand it would like to confirm the long-standing American position, which essentially is that the Baltic states are independent. On the other hand, of course, U.S. officials passionately want M.S. Gorbachev to remain in power." A report by this same television company from Vilnius said: "Gorbachev heard out everyone who threw down a challenge to him and then went determinedly onto the offensive, once again urging people to think a thousand times before taking steps to secede from the Soviet Union." The television company expressed the opinion that the 3 days M.S. Gorbachev spent in Lithuania will not lead to immediate changes.

Paris: "Right up until the last moment of his stay in Lithuania, M.S. Gorbachev did everything possible to persuade his interlocutors that his theories are right," an observer from French television's Channel 2 pointed out. "He spoke out in favor of giving the Lithuanians maximum freedom within the framework of the Soviet Union and the framework of restructuring. He put forward ideas for a fundamentally new federation of Soviet republics and said that we need each other: The Soviet Union needs Lithuania and vice versa. He even mentioned the possibility of transferring to a multiparty system. However, all his proposals met with a very guarded reception from the people of Lithuania."

The most important thing for the Soviet leader in Lithuania was his dialogue with the inhabitants of the republic. It demonstrated in practice that the policy of restructuring has radically reduced the distance between the people and their leaders, a correspondent for L'HUMANITE said.

M.S. Gorbachev is convinced that new impetus can be given to the existence of the Soviet federation on condition that the foundations of this federation are changed completely, LE MONDE remarked.

Bonn: The Soviet leader urged Lithuanian Communists to act in a well-considered, reasonable manner, an observer from ZDF stressed. M.S. Gorbachev pointed to the shortsightedness and selfishness of some Lithuanian representatives in favor of secession from the Soviet Union, the leading television channel said.

Tokyo: While emphasizing that the Soviet Union must resolve its ethnic problems itself, MAINICHI urged the USSR to "refrain from making hasty decisions" on the problems that have arisen in Lithuania. "We would like M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet people to continue their serious efforts to sustain dialogue and persuade with the aid of political means, whatever the difficulties," ASAHI wrote.

Rogachev Holds Talks in Paris on Cambodia

LD1401225790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2030 GMT 14 Jan 90

[Text] Paris, 14 Jan (TASS)—Conversations between I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, R. Solomon, U.S. assistant secretary of state, and C. Martin, director of the Asia and Oceania Department at the French Foreign Ministry, were held in the French capital today. The talks were held in connection with a meeting due to be held here between representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on matters concerning a Cambodian settlement.

I.A. Rogachev met M. Costello, the Australian deputy minister of foreign affairs and trade on the same day.

Foreign Ministry Official on Vienna Talks

LD1301124490 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT
13 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 13 TASS—By TASS correspondent Konstantin Voitsekhovich:

The final document of the European Vienna meeting, the anniversary of which is celebrated on January 15, underscores a new dimension of European cooperation, Yuriy Reshetov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights Department, told TASS.

This document, he continued, gave an especially powerful impetus to the humanitarian dimension of the European process.

On completion of the Vienna meeting, the diplomat recalled, the Soviet Union undertook a step, which was unique from the point of view of international law, by declaring that it considered the provisions of the Vienna final document to be binding for it. The new legislation, concerning foreign travel, freedom of conscience, press and mass media, which are being prepared, take account of these provisions.

At the same time, Reshetov said, there has been a delay in work to realize the provisions of the Vienna documents, which provide for repealing instructions and subordinate legislation that exist inside the country and run counter to them. These instructions remain in force, in particular, in the system of registration which, in actual fact, reduces to nought the relevant article of the international covenant on the right of freedom of movement. In the 1988 provision on psychiatric activity, "breaching rules of socialist community" is one of the grounds for subjecting man to psychiatric analysis. This term, which is neither legal nor medical, allows for a broad interpretation in the field where maximum tact needs to be shown under any circumstances.

"As for the limitations on the use of copying equipment in the USSR, radical changes have taken place in this respect and its use will be legalised in the nearest future," the diplomat said.

Reshetov drew attention to the fact that many Western countries (with the exception of the Federal Republic of Germany) are in no hurry to bring their domestic legislation in line with the Vienna accords. He especially stressed the attitude to capital punishment. The Vienna document stresses the need to restrict the sphere of its application which, in particular, was done by the USSR. This provision is yet to be implemented in some countries, including the United States, the Soviet diplomat said in conclusion.

'Observers Roundtable' Views CEMA, Arms Talks

LD1501000390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1230 GMT 14 Jan 90

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by Gennadiy Vedenyapin, with foreign political commentator Boris Andrianov and Rudolf Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD]

[Excerpts] [Vedenyapin] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners. We begin another broadcast of International Observers Roundtable. At the microphone is the chairman, Gennadiy Vedenyapin. Taking part in today's conversation are my colleague, the All-Union Radio foreign political commentator Boris Andrianov and the deputy editor in chief of the newspaper TRUD, Rudolf Kolchanov.

[Andrianov] Undoubtedly, one of the most important events of international life this week has been the 45th session of CEMA. As expected, it was not the sort of routine session we've been used to for many years, but marked a turning point and laid the foundation of our new future economic relations.

[Kolchanov] One can say that in recent years there has been mounting criticism of the state of affairs in CEMA, with persistent demands for an overhaul of its entire mechanism. It is being emphasized that the existing external economic ties of the socialist countries are lagging far behind the processes that have begun to take place in some of the socialist countries earlier, and in others later. So the established traditional economic relations among countries which were based on goods exchange rather than trade have gradually begun to conflict with the economic reforms that have been implemented in those countries.

[Vedenyapin] At this 45th session of CEMA, the participants put aside the proposed agenda and discussed the fundamental question of future cooperation. They did so, moreover, in an atmosphere of complete frankness. The speakers were practically unanimous on what should be the main directions in shaping an adequate market

environment that will combine the real economic interests of particular goods producers and of the national economies as a whole.

[Kolchanov] Yes, they were unanimous, though there also were certain differences. But we'll deal with those a little later. First, let's take the things they agreed on. The session underlined the need for a resolute renewal of the whole system of mutual cooperation and of the machinery of multilateral cooperation within CEMA, of a radical renewal of the work of the council, of a revision of its functions and objectives and of drawing up a new charter in keeping with the present and longterm requirements of interaction among CEMA countries. [passage omitted]

[Andrianov] The 45th session of the CEMA has, in its whole meaning and content, been a continuation of the results of last year, which was rightly called the year of Europe. In this connection, I want to return to events which also fit into the context of the European Year. The day before yesterday, the fifth round of the talks on conventional arms forces in Europe opened in Vienna: the round to which we rightly attach something like decisive importance for the signing of a future agreement. [passage omitted]

[Kolchanov] But all the same there are still quite a few unsolved problems preventing tangible progress at the Vienna forum. For example, the West admits that our proposal that frontline tactical aircraft should be included in the reductions is a move toward compromise. But our Western partners have still given us no concrete answer to our proposals.

It is also beyond dispute that, as of late, the subject of reducing military personnel has nearly been dropped from discussion at the conference table, although such a reduction undoubtedly would be an important factor for stability in the present European situation. The United States and the other NATO countries are still against it, even though they cannot give any convincing or logical explanation for this. Take, for example, the situation regarding the reduction of troops that are in Europe outside their national territories. The West insists that these restrictions should apply only to the Soviet and U.S. troops. We're not at all against this, but we propose a simultaneous reduction of the forces of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Canada stationed in West Germany. This amounts to about 160,000 men, or by NATO norms, ten divisions. You'll agree that this is not negligible. Yet, the issue has been left in the air and one gets the impression that our Western partners at the Vienna talks seem to be losing interest in what is certainly an important area and the actual subject of the talks.

[Andrianov] Another question that remains open is that of defining battlefield tanks and armored vehicles. In general NATO accepts the idea of including as defining criteria of tanks the parameters of weight and calibre of guns. But the figures named by representatives of the

North Atlantic bloc are very far indeed from being realistic. It isn't difficult to discern behind this a desire to achieve one-sided advantages without taking the interests of the other side into account.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, and the level of 14,000 vehicles for combat vehicles, infantry and light tanks which has been embodied in the so-called new extended category of battlefield armored vehicles gives further cause for concern. This is because, on the one hand, that ceiling gives the West a possibility of a buildup of light tanks, while, on the other, it presupposes the destruction of the larger part of the combat vehicles and infantry of the Warsaw Pact.

[Kolchanov] Incidentally, you can't by any means describe as normal the situation that has arisen at the Vienna talks with regard to artillery. Unfortunately, there is still no agreement on the numerical parameters of the proposed reductions, nor have the actual lists of systems been precisely specified. Moreover, there are a number of other problems that are preventing progress.

[Andrianov] Take, for example, the fact that further progress at the talks is being hindered by the clearly over-narrow approach of the Western partners to stabilizing measures. In effect, they're only willing to extend them to three categories of conventional armed forces—tanks, artillery, and armored vehicles—even though the talks, as we all know, are being conducted on the basis of six categories. Moreover, in the opinion of the Warsaw Pact, one of the most important stabilizing measures is the structural reorganization, by the sides, of their armed forces in an effort to make them strictly defensive. Yet this undoubtedly important aspect has in effect been passed over in NATO's proposals. [passage omitted]

[Vedenyapin] I imagine many people have looked at the reports that appeared a few days ago that say the United States is reviewing its policy regarding Afghanistan. This allegedly is caused by the Afghan mujahidin's inability to gain appreciable success in military actions and by the

escalation of armed clashes between rival insurgent groupings. This has been reported by THE WASHINGTON TIMES with reference to highly placed members of the Bush administration. According to the paper, the White House analysis of the U.S. political line in the region could lead to a cut in U.S. arms deliveries to the Afghan insurgents and to more active involvement of the United Nations Organization in settling the conflict in Afghanistan.

[Andrianov] We'll have to wait and see, as they say, but for the moment is it not worth playing with illusions? For some reason, one highly placed member of the Bush government to whom THE WASHINGTON TIMES correspondents talked reiterated that for the moment it is not a matter of, as he put it, instant revolutionary changes in U.S. policy in the region. He did, however, admit that new ideas are being put forward and the administration is endeavoring to adapt its line to the altered situation within Afghanistan.

[Kolchanov] There are rumors and hints that something is going on behind the scenes in the Bush administration, but it is unclear as yet just what is going on there. It is, however, perfectly clear that the outward position of official U.S. figures on the Afghan issue has not changed. At least, Washington has as before a hostile attitude to the government of the Republic of Afghanistan and continues to demand the unconditional departure of President Najibullah.

[Vedenyapin] In a word, there is no point being hasty in drawing conclusions and it would be better to wait until Washington shows in concrete actions rather than discourse that it has made a correct analysis of the reasons for the failure of U.S. policy in Afghanistan and has learned its lesson from that analysis.

So here we'll bring our roundtable meeting to a close. Those taking part, Boris Andrianov and Rudolf Kolchanov, along with program presenter Gennadiy Vedenyapin, thank you, esteemed comrade listeners, for your attention. Goodbye and all the best.

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Reports on 'Neutralized' U.S. Agent

PM1701110190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[V. Chertkov article: "Unreported. KGB Organs Have Neutralized a Dangerous Spy"; first two paragraphs are in form of an introduction]

[Text] He has a Russian surname, given name, and patronymic: A compatriot. I may have traveled with him in the same subway car or sat next to him at the theater. It is this man, whom I will subsequently call "Donald" (a pseudonym he was given by the U.S. special services), who became a spy.

How can all this be explained? Where are the roots of his treachery? It is naive to attribute everything to the fact that he was passed over at work, that his abilities were not fully appreciated (such opinions do exist). He began working for the FBI in 1961—at the first stages of his career, which later raised him to a very high position.

Since time immemorial grain and weeds have grown alongside one another. It will be a long time before our field is cleared.... I do not think that anyone would undertake to say that he knows all the tricks of the human heart. What are our hearts like? It is sometimes terrifying to look into one's own heart, nevertheless we are trying to interpret the motives in someone else's heart. We hastily diagnose a particular action, although we are contemplating the incredible depths of the human heart which cannot be experienced even in an entire lifetime.

In this instance too we are not dealing with a primitive specimen. The roots were hidden somewhere in the depths. Maybe that is why our tree is ailing—because it is sustained by such roots. We all hope for recovery, God willing.

Here is what V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, said at the summer session of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "Counterintelligence, that is, defense of our interests and secrets, is one of the main areas of state security organs' activity... In the last few years alone state security organs have exposed and instituted criminal proceedings against approximately 30 agents from certain Western countries' special services." "Donald" was one of the most important figures among them. The foreign press is circulating all manner of cock-and-bull stories about this case in order to ensure that the U.S. secret services look good and to hush up this agent's failure. This case is quite fresh and has not as yet been banished to the archives.

The KGB investigator sitting in front me still remembered every word uttered by "Donald", who, like me, saw out of the window this same apartment block. It is inhabited by all manner of people—good and bad, the not-so-well-off and the prosperous. All the same most of

them share roughly the same ideals and allow no one to sully them. There are values whose sanctity depends not only on the system but also on each individual's decency and moral purity. That is when something private in us becomes the common spirit of the people—betrayal of this spirit is equivalent to betrayal of everyone and the homeland. However attractively baseness is dressed up, it was, is, and remains baseness.

A foreign intelligence instruction recommends trying all possible keys to the human heart: "It is not only devotion to the ideals of the free world, not only hatred for the Soviet system, but also wounded personal self-esteem; egoistical interests, lust for gain, moral bankruptcy; dissatisfaction with professional position, relationships with loose women, and a tendency for alcoholism that most frequently prompt certain Soviet citizens to set about providing intelligence officers with secret information. An intelligence officer must direct his efforts into finding such people in order to recruit them for cooperation." What did they plan on in "Donald's" case? What weaknesses or strong convictions? His explanation went as follows:

"I grew accustomed to walking on a knife-edge and could not imagine any other life."

Although he became entangled as to the motives for his lapse, political and ideological degeneration can nonetheless be traced against the backdrop of pathological self-esteem. In some places people failed to understand him—and there he and behold were his vanity and self-love with their distorting mirrors. What is more, he was conceited. He did not believe he would fail; he thought that no one would establish his guilt before he died since his every step was well thought-out.

"I sensed in my backbone that the KGB was at my heels. However, analysis of their activity disproved my misgivings."

There was conjecture, but he skillfully covered his tracks. He was caught—who would have thought it—by carelessness brought on, evidently, by a weariness that had built up over the years. Chekists [security officials] succeeded in "cracking" the code of his radio reports. They hunted for the spy on the basis of his reports. Although quite a few people have access to this information, they nonetheless bagged "Donald" through scrupulous work, without allowing the filthy slur to besmirch honest people.

On a damp late-November evening in 1961 he—by no means a rank-and-file member of the Soviet UN mission—met John F. (an FBI staffer to whom he had been introduced the previous evening at a reception given by the Americans) on a New York street and passed to him information regarding the nature of our diplomats' activity, information on cipher clerks, and cipher themselves. With access to a great deal of information that constituted state secrets, "Donald" traded in everything of interest to the U.S. special service. All subsequent meetings, until the summer of 1962, took place in the

Kamerun [name as transliterated] Hotel. "Donald" returned to Moscow crammed with various instructions and modes of communication and supplied with a secret operations schedule (one per quarter).

"So rarely?"

"Is it rare to put your life in mortal danger four times a year?" the investigator answered my question with another question, and I understood the kind of man with whom he was dealing, and it became clear why "Donald's" face showed no fear even during his detention.

The tiny magnetic containers (he preferred to make them himself) in which the espionage information was hidden he left on Bolshaya Polyanka and Bolshaya Ordynka Streets, at the Dobryninskaya Subway Station, at the "Plushchad Vosstaniya" streetcar stop, in the Gorkiy Central Park of Culture and Rest, and on the beltway... The hiding places were marked by various graphic signs and signals and were often found en route to his place of work and back. The man traveled along the same route and never met anyone who could give rise to suspicion. Yet Penkovskiy, a spy with almost the same length of service as "Donald," was arrested at that time. You'd have thought he ought to have come to his senses, gone into hiding, put himself on his guard, and ultimately taken fright—he is human after all—but no... He was only more careful and more detailed in working out the options for his espionage activity.

His cipher tables were hidden in a resourceful fashion, along with his tablets for displaying secret writing, his instructions, and his interludes... In the attic of his mother's home, in the dust jackets of books, in a brush for cleaning spectacles... With his brilliant education and being a teacher in an academy, he had an equally good grasp of many questions.

The range of "Donald's" activity was great and can be traced in coded messages from the special services published in THE NEW YORK TIMES. Here is one of them dated 20 May 1964, which was then repeated in the "Personal Announcements" column 10 days in succession.

"Moody-Donald F., please write as promised.

"Everything is well with Uncle Charles and Sister Clara. They would like you to write them.

"Don't forget the addresses of Dave, Doug, and their spouses.

"Do you intend to travel? When? Where?"

"We hope that our entire family will soon meet up once again.

"Greetings and best wishes, brothers Edward H. and John F. Closter, New Jersey."

Here is what these lines actually meant:

"Please, write as promised" is a reminder not to forget the definite modes of communication with the intelligence center.

"Everything is well with Uncle Charles and Sister Clara. They would like you to write to them" signifies the Americans' readiness to work using the aforementioned hiding place.

Each sentence has a hidden meaning, only these words need an explanation: "Do you intend to travel? When? Where?"

"Donald" went to work in Burma. A report appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "Moody-Donald F. I was extremely glad to learn of your good fortune. I will call on you soon. Everything is fine. John F."

FBI staffer John F. did not keep him waiting. He arrived in Rangoon using the name John Mori [last name as transliterated] and had regular meetings with "Donald" before he handed him over to CIA agents. The practical work of the USSR state security organs illustrates that foreign intelligence officers are endeavoring to collect diverse information encompassing the socialist countries' politics, economy, ideology, and culture, along with their military potential and scientific and technical capabilities. "Donald" obtained important and very varied information, including information about rice, wheat, and corn diseases and means of defense against chemical and bacteriological weapons...

We discussed "Donald's" behavior with Colonel A.S. Dukhanin, who headed the investigation, and I saw that my interlocutor—in order to avoid one-sidedness—deliberately traced the bright spots in this life which cannot simply be cursed. After all he fought well...

Dukhanin, who came to the KGB in the early 1980's, and 10 other investigators spent several months on the "Donald" case. It ended recently; a trial took place which concluded the matter (with the death penalty). But the colonel now has a new and equally complex case facing him, although the upheavals of his previous case are still part of his life. He is entrusted with the difficult and complex cases that require supreme exertion of effort and the mobilization of all knowledge, that is why it is hard to abandon them and make them a thing of the past straightaway. An investigation is a skillful struggle, a subtle game in which you must play the ace of trumps. The profession of investigator is a creative one, everything tackled in the course of his work lingers in his memory for a long time, since it is all of such painful origin.

And can we ever forget the case (also recent) of V.A. Pavlov and Yu.V. Smelyakov, who worked at the "Tekhnobimexport" Foreign Trade Association. Valuables worth over \$1 million were confiscated from the former and around \$300,000 from the latter. They were charged with various official malpractices harmful to the USSR's economy. In exchange for bribes they gave contracts to

second-rate firms, which increased the cost of construction at Soviet projects and forced our country to make up the difference from its own internal resources. They involved intermediary firms and were rewarded for enabling them to make money. The transmission of official secrets is another occupation for which dealers paid well.

From the widow of the writer O. Maltsev Pavlov bought a dacha in Peredelkino for a little over \$100,000, and there they found tens of thousands of dollars; 21 gold bars; 338 gold chains; 100 rings set with precious stones; 70 pendants; and some magnificent weapons.

The protection of trade secrets and commercial secrecy has become very topical for us," V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, said recently. "The fact is that many thousands of our enterprises have established direct trade and economic ties with other countries. But we are still very poor businessmen. And unless we protect our commercial secrets this may harm our state to the tune of billions." One Soviet department engaged in overseas construction caused our country losses costing \$13,289,009. The "kind uncles" or, more precisely, sophisticated criminals used to accept a firm's overstated prices and offer unwarranted privileges and concessions, thus enabling foreigners to amass superprofits at the USSR's expense. As a cover there was one version of the contract in English and a different one in Russian. The department's leadership set up a vast reserve fund—around \$3 billion—which it used independently.

"The businessmen were overpaid on a large scale, and of course there was a reason for all this," the investigator said. "Afraid of damaging the firm's name, many businessmen returned the money, saying that they had not dealt fairly with us."

The ultimate punishment and long prison terms are the price that our fellow citizens have paid for their intrigues. I have described what Dukhanin was doing while "Donald" was on vacation and was recovering from the fatigue built up in Burma. However, even while on vacation he was in contact with the CIA. In his Moscow apartment a special lamp in a clock on a table lit up in response to a radio signal—we are making contact, information has been taken from the hiding place. Within the family it wasn't done to ask unnecessary questions, although even the ordinary flashing light of the militia arouses simple human curiosity.

In the early seventies "Donald" went to work in India. Here he met with a U.S. intelligence agent, Paul L. Elinor, who would introduce him to new espionage equipment—a high speed R/T (radioteletype) set designed for use in urban areas. In Moscow "Donald" used it to transmit information to the Americans from a streetcar traveling past the embassy.

Merely the listing of "Donald's" personal meetings with U.S. intelligence agents ran to dozens of pages. Reading the information passed on by him, I thought with some

considerable amazement: "My God, we have no idea what kind of things interest the special services."

During his second assignment in Delhi "Donald" was warned that a report had been published in the open press in the United States on the treachery of a USSR staffer at the United Nations in the early sixties who had offered his services to the FBI. His first thought was: "This means me. But how did they guess?" On his return to Moscow "Donald" destroyed a considerable portion of his espionage equipment but kept intact the instruction on contacting the U.S. intelligence center should he need to leave the country.

He became even more alarmed when a medical commission forbade him to go to hot countries on health grounds. "No, this is just a pretext. They have begun to suspect me." But he checked everything carefully and found no one shadowing him. Inwardly he seemed to calm down, but his eyes became restless and there was nothing he could do about it. The Americans asked him to collect information on civil defense and find out the USSR's plans for the use of nuclear weapons in military conflicts. He transmitted information from the Inguri cafe, the Krasnaya Presnya bathhouse, the Vanda store, the Central Tourist House, Tchaikovsky Street...

He would always remember the password "607 Madison Avenue" in case he suddenly had to go abroad and find his paymasters there in an emergency. However... try to tear a sheet of paper into a thousand pieces; mix them up; and then put them back in their original place. The KGB organs had to do something like that to recreate the whole picture without getting anything muddled up.

The phrase "looking for a needle in a haystack" couldn't be more appropriate than here. And they found it.

U.S. Argument Over 'Peace Dividend' Previewed

PM1701085990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jan 90 Second Edition p7

[Vitaliy Gan commentary: "People Getting Heated"]

[Text] Washington—There is still more than a week left before U.S. Congress resumes work, but a major battle is already brewing between the White House and the legislators.

The straightening out of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and the thawing of the "cold war" ice have inspired the hope among Americans that they are going to be the recipients of the so-called "peace dividend": cuts in the insane military budget and the transfer of the resources thereby obtained to resolve the country's acute social problems. Reaching sensitively to the mood of the electorate, particularly in the present election year, many members of Congress have said that they will make the "peace dividend" the main item on the agenda of the forthcoming session.

In the last few days, what were previously perfectly peaceful debates have taken on a confrontational nature.

It all started with the speech by U.S. President Bush last Friday in Cincinnati, Ohio. To all appearances, the president is determined to shatter Americans' dreams once and for all regarding the benefits to be gained from the easing of tension. Describing those who are counting on the "peace dividend" as naive, Bush said: "Just as it was impossible 6 months ago to predict the amazing changes in Europe, it is still impossible now to predict what is going to happen in the next 6 months, let alone the next 6 years. The United States must be strong. A strong America does not just mean a strong economy. It still means a strong defense and armed forces that are prepared and highly efficient." It is not yet the time, he said, to "naively cut the muscles of our defense. That would be like the relative who squandered his inheritance before the will had been read. That is not what is going to happen."

The opposition does not agree with this. M. Cuomo, a leading U.S. political figure and governor of New York State, has pointed out that the "cold war" which has cost us trillions of dollars is now at an end. We must benefit from this."

It has long been reckoned that Congress usually approves 90% of administration requests for Pentagon appropriations. Specialists predict that this time the battle for the remaining 10% will be unusually bitter. "The administration is pretending that nothing has happened. It is making out that the Berlin Wall is still in place," one member of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee said. These words of his can well be regarded as an indication of the direction and nature of the forthcoming Congress debates. Contrary to the president's beliefs, it is expected that the Democratic majority in the U.S. supreme legislature will aim for radical cuts in the Pentagon budget for Fiscal 1991. Even a figure is being given: somewhere in the region of \$15 billion.

Bush Administration Reviews Afghan Policy

Possible Motives Examined

PM1601123190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

["Own Correspondent" dispatch: "Fresh Ideas? What Is Behind the News About a Review of U.S. Policy on Afghanistan"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Jan.—The Bush Administration has given signs that Washington has embarked on a review of its policy toward Afghanistan. It is specifically reported that there is a possibility of a change in U.S. tactics in the approach toward the problem of a settlement of the conflict, which has hitherto been blocked primarily by the United States itself. At the same time it has become known that Under Secretary of State R. Kimmitt, "Number 3" in the U.S. Department of State, will be making his way with "fresh ideas" for talks with representatives of Pakistan and the Afghan opposition at the end of this week. Kimmitt, who will be accompanied

by P. Tomsen, U.S. ambassador to the mujahidin "transitional government," will be the first high-ranking member of the Bush Administration to visit the region.

Even though details of the ongoing analysis have not been publicized, administration officials who confirmed that it is taking place but asked to remain anonymous noted that, among other issues, there is discussion of involving the United Nations as a "potential partner" in the implementation of certain new U.S. initiatives. Hitherto Washington has been categorically opposed to any role by this international organization in the settlement of the Afghan conflict, even in the light of its successful mediation efforts.

Last November the United Nations again issued a call for an urgent start to peace talks in Afghanistan. UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar put forward a plan envisaging the formation of a single delegation from Afghan opposition groupings for talks with the Kabul government on the country's political structure. But this plan—at least so far—has been left hanging in the air because the United States continues to insist on a demand for the "unconditional resignation" of Najibullah, head of the Kabul government.

According to officials, a proposal to introduce a joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on arms supplies to the combatants is also being examined in the course of the analysis. But these officials hinted that the United States, which supplies the mujahidin with arms worth at least \$600 million a year, is hardly likely to agree to such a moratorium.

Without any fear of being wrong, it can be assumed that there is no unanimity within the administration as to whether it is worth sticking to the old line which has produced nothing but more death and suffering. In any case, however, as yet it is too early to say whether Washington will really start pursuing a "new policy" which will be more realistic and will actually help to put an end to the bloodshed in Afghanistan. After all, it cannot be ruled out that this news report is a targeted "information leak" organized by those who are actually unwilling to abandon the hard line and are thus trying to "mobilize" their supporters among the U.S. rightwingers to pressure the administration.

Could Mean Arms Embargo

PM1701105990 Moscow KRA: N4YA ZVEZDA
in Russian 16 Jan 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Washington Reviews Policy"]

[Text] Washington, 15 Jan.—The United States is reviewing its policy toward Afghanistan in connection with the opposition's inability to achieve appreciable success in military operations and also with the escalation of armed clashes between rival rebel groupings. THE WASHINGTON TIMES announced this, citing high-ranking staffers in the G. Bush administration. White House analysis of the U.S. political course in the

region could, in the newspaper's opinion, ultimately result in the cessation of U.S. weapons shipments to the Afghan rebels and also in more active UN involvement in attempts to settle the conflict in Afghanistan.

THE WASHINGTON TIMES notes in this connection that "new ideas are being put forward and the Administration is trying to adapt its course to the changing situation in Afghanistan." Thus, it has returned to considering the proposals which it previously rejected for a U.S.-Soviet moratorium on weapons shipments to the country.

China

Jiang Zemin Cited on Need for Political Unity

PM1601132990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 14 Jan 90 Single Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Unity of Aspirations"]

[Text] The CPC's [Communist Party of China's] "United Front" policy is one of the most important component parts of the party's general course.

Major successes have been achieved in the last decade thanks to the implementation of this policy, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, said when meeting participants in an all-China conference of activists from the "United Front" movement, which came to a close in Beijing on Friday after proposing that all democratic parties and social organizations unite under CPC leadership.

He said that the "United Front" is necessary for maintaining social stability, regulating the economy, deepening reform, implementing the "one state—two social systems" policy, uniting the country, and ensuring China's continued prosperity.

Jiang Zemin said that the "United Front" in China "must rally all forces capable of being rallied."

Aviation Cooperation with PRC Reviewed

OW1401184990 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0600 GMT 25 Dec 89

[From the "Business Club" program]

[Text] In the last week of the outgoing year, representatives of the Civil Aviation Administration of China will accept the last of the 25 Tu-154M passenger planes built by the Soviet Union, on a order placed by the administration at the Kuybyshev City airport in the Volga valley and fly it to Urumqi. Let me freshen our listeners' memories a bit: The first Soviet-made passenger planes made their debut in China in 1963—that is, the Il-18's. Then the An-2 and An-24, both passenger airplanes, the Mi-8 helicopter, and the An-26 freighter began to fly China's air routes. I think our listeners already know many of these aircraft, for they are still in use in China

today. Our station reporter Vasilyev asked (Zitudinidzhin), general manager of the Soviet Aircraft Export Company, to talk about USSR-PRC cooperation in the field of civil aviation in recent years.

[(Zitudinidzhin) heard speaking briefly in Russian] (Zitudinidzhin) said: We began negotiations with our Chinese partners on the Tu-154M passenger planes in 1983. This model is (? one of the few) passenger airplanes around the world that can take off in Tibet's mountainous region. To be sure, the airport of Lhasa is situated on an altitude of 4,500 meters above sea level. The higher the altitude, the harder it is for an aircraft to start its engine, and the longer the runway needs to be. With every factor taken into account, the Tu-154M passenger plane is suitable in every way. We have completed supplying China with 25 Tu-154M's this year.

The advantages brought by this kind of cooperation are worth mentioning. Appealing to the Chinese civil aviation workers is the possibility of paying with commodities and raw materials instead of foreign exchanges. It just so happens that our country needs fine quality, inexpensive, and trendy Chinese consumer goods. Also years of contacts [words indistinct]. In addition, the Soviet Union not only supplied China with aircraft and maintenance service but also helped train Chinese pilots.

(Zitudinidzhin) said: All the Chinese crewmembers flying the Tu-154M's had trained in the Soviet Union's (Uliyanovskiy) Pilots Training Center. In 1985 when the first Tu-154M's were supplied to China, the Soviet Union helped train several flight crews especially for this type of passenger plane; those crew members underwent (3 or 4) month's training. So far, we have trained approximately 60 or 70 flight crews for China and ground-duty personnel for minor aircraft repairs. Any major repairs of any type on the Soviet aircraft will be done by a Soviet aircraft work group permanently stationed in China. Sometimes, when major repairs are necessary, an aircraft will be sent back to the manufacturer in the Soviet Union.

Just as the general manager of the All-Soviet Aircraft Export Company emphatically pointed out, an aircraft seller is held accountable to its consumers for maintaining the quality of its products until the warranted time of use expires.

Last, I asked (Zitudinidzhin) about the plan for future cooperation with China. (Zitudinidzhin) answered: We will provide China with another lot of Tu-154M's to China next year. For its part, China intends to buy from us 10 Yak-32's and the (Wu-17) helicopter between 1990 and 1991. Incidentally, at the Beijing International Aviation Show held this October, the Soviet Union, in addition to displaying a variety of aircraft, put on exhibition some of the third-generation aircraft whose production will begin in the next couple of years, including the Il-96, Tu-204, and Il-114. Chinese comrades expressed great interest and will wait to see the prototypes to make the final decision on contracts.

Technology Company Official Views Cooperation*OW1501005990 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0600 GMT 26 Dec 89*

[Text] A gratifying event in the past year is the further development of Soviet-Chinese relations in science and technology. In scientific and technological cooperation, the All-Union Technology Import and Export Company represents the interests of many enterprises and companies in the Soviet Union. Our reporter, (Garipov), had a conversation with (Krivk), a leader of that company.

Our reporter asked (Krivk): It has been 3 years since the Technology Import and Export Company began to enter the Chinese market. During these 3 years, it has found a number of partners in China. What are the new trends of cooperation that have appeared over the past year?

[(Krivk) is briefly heard speaking in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] He said: During the past year, the Technology Import and Export Company continued to develop substantive relations with its Chinese partners. For instance, our company took an active part in the first international sales exhibition in Beijing, and also in the Chinese Science and Technology Exhibition in Moscow, both held last summer. During the exhibitions, we established substantive relations with some new partners and signed a series of agreements on the establishment of joint ventures.

Our reporter asked: As far as the establishment of joint ventures is concerned, you are no longer new at providing services to Soviet organizations and companies. However, it was not until 1989 that you entered the Chinese market with the proposal of forming joint ventures. In your opinion, what initial results have been achieved?

[(Krivk) briefly heard speaking in Russian] He replied: We have signed several agreements on the establishment of joint ventures in Estonia. A number of agreements will also be signed on the establishment of joint ventures in electronics and lumber processing in the European part of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republics. In addition, we plan to set up some joint ventures in Outer Caucasus to provide local residents with medical, tourism, and food services.

Our reporter asked: Do you also have plans to set up joint ventures in China?

(Krivk) said: We have such plans. In the past year, we have discussed a host of questions concerning this. However, the matter is still pending because the Soviet organizations that may participate in such joint ventures lack the necessary foreign exchange. I wish to point out that there are several factors hindering the development of the scientific and technological relations between the two sides. One of these is the method for foreign exchange conversion based on Swiss francs. This conversion method is inconvenient for both sides. Obviously a new foreign exchange conversion mechanism is required. There is also a trade problem. For example, the

Chinese side does not need the products of the above joint ventures that are to be established, namely, electronic equipment, lumber products, and new [words indistinct]. On the other hand, China shows great interest in the materials that are available in our country but have not been put to use or have not been used efficiently. Development of trade and cooperation in this aspect is hindered by the regulations governing the export rights currently in effect in our country. To remove the obstacles placed by various departments, (Krivk) pointed out that we should do a great deal of work next year.

Our reporter asked: Is there any problem on the side of the Chinese partners obstructing the development of cooperation?

[(Krivk) briefly heard speaking in Russian] During the past 3 years, due to the reform carried out in China, we have encountered some obstacles. Some changes have taken place in China. These changes are related to the reexamination of enterprises authorized to engage in foreign trade. Also under reexamination are export-oriented performance and their management systems. This, of course, will not result in the cancellation of the contracts, but will prolong the time required for studying the questions and may cause a delay of several months. We believe there will be fewer problems next year, said (Krivk), leader of the Technology Import and Export Company of the Soviet Union.

Technological Cooperation Ties Surveyed*OW1501045390 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1400 GMT 9 Jan 90*

[Text] Let us now talk about new developments in direct Soviet-Chinese cooperation. Direct ties established between enterprises and organizations of the Soviet Union and China have played an increasingly important role in the vigorous development of economic, scientific, and technological cooperation between the two countries. Last year more than (?100) enterprises established cooperative ties. An agreement on direct cooperation between Moscow's (Chotatov) Atomic Energy Research Institute and China's High-Tech Company, Ltd, was signed on New Year's Eve last year. The following is a report by station reporter [Marchenko]:

The company is especially engaged in spreading the latest technology in industrial production [words indistinct]. (Wei Yonghe), manager of the company said:

[Begin recording] This cooperation between us and the Atomic Energy Research Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences is (?based on the principle of voluntariness). Taking part in the cooperation from the Chinese side are three units: our company, the China High-Tech Company, Ltd, under the leadership of the State Science and Technology Commission; the China Precision Machinery Import and Export Company under the Ministry of Aeronautics and Astronautics; and Beijing Teachers University.

[Words indistinct] has wide application. It is understood that this technology can be applied to minicomputers, optical equipment, medical diagnosis, and material analysis. [end recording]

The work under the leadership of (Wei Yonghe) involves all spheres of science and technology, including biological engineering, information, and space and laser technology. The company is one of China's most successful ones. It has many cooperation partners overseas, including noted corporations in Western countries. Its cooperation with the Soviet Union has special significance. Why? Manager (Wei Yonghe) gives the following explanation:

[Begin recording] There are very good results in this respect. The Chinese side has a stronger capability in applying scientific results to the production of commodities. In this way the advantages of the Chinese and Soviet sides can be combined and applied to the production of commodities and products for the world market. Therefore, it is mutually beneficial to the USSR and China to further exchange experiences in structural reform of science and technology, in other words, to consult each other on matters of common concern. [end recording]

RSFSR Commercial Official Comments on Trade

*OW1401213290 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0600 GMT 27 Dec 89*

[Text] Listeners, I want to tell you that the Ministry of Commerce of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], the largest republic of the USSR, and China's Ministry of Commerce signed a trade protocol in Beijing early this month. Signing on behalf of the Soviet side was Tikhonov, vice minister of commerce of the RSFSR. During an interview with him a few days ago, our station reporter (Marorov) asked him to describe the development of RSFSR's trade with China.

[Tikhonov heard speaking briefly in Russian, fading into translation by announcer] Comrade Tikhonov said: RSFSR's trade relations with China resumed in the Soviet Far East in 1984. In accordance with a decision adopted by the Soviet Government at that time, foreign trade organs of the Khabarovsk border region, the coastal region, and the Amur Oblast began to trade with China. I want to point out that RSFSR's trade relations with China have far exceeded the scope of border trade. The development of direct trade relations between some oblasts and enterprises in the RSFSR and some Chinese provinces and municipalities has been particularly rapid. It is estimated that the volume of bilateral trade in 1989 will be a record high, exceeding 500 million Swiss Francs.

What will the RSFSR's trade relations with China be like in 1990?

Comrade Tikhonov continued: The RSFSR Ministry of Commerce and the Chinese Ministry of Commerce have

signed a new 1990 trade protocol, which provides that bilateral trade will be expanded. I would like to point out that, in addition to trading with traditional trade partners as Heilongjiang and Liaoning Provinces, and the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, the RSFSR will establish trade relations with some provinces in southern China—such as Guangdong and Fujian—and some special economic zones in China in 1990. Thus, in addition to importing from China such traditional goods as garments, daily necessities, and other goods in the near future, we will also import electronic computers, video cassette recorders, audio equipment, television sets, and other electronic goods; the Soviet side will export to China machinery, timber products, chemicals, and metallurgical goods.

Listeners, we wish Soviet and Chinese trade partners new successes in the field of trade.

Amity Society Leader Cites 1989 Contacts

*OW1501062290 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1400 GMT 27 Dec 89*

[From the "Take the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" program]

[Text] The complete normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and China in 1989 had to be reflected in the contacts between Soviet and Chinese friendship societies. What were the characteristics of these contacts in 1989? Our reporter, (Shelbayev), raised this question with Comrade (Minov), a responsible secretary of the Central Board of the Soviet-China Friendship Society.

[(Minov) is briefly heard in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] (Minov) said: In 1989 the contacts between Soviet and Chinese friendship societies were aimed mainly at promoting direct contacts between the two countries' experts in various fields. In 1989, the Soviet Union played host to a delegation of Chinese space experts for the first time. Members of the delegation included scientists, designers, and engineers. The visit made it possible for them to understand the development of space science in the Soviet Union, and tour the telecommunications control center of the space flight administration and space technology manufacturing plant. The visit also made it possible for Soviet and Chinese space experts to establish direct contacts.

(Minov) said: The year also saw an exchange of visits by winners of the contests held both in the Soviet Union and China in language and knowledge about each other. The visitors from our country were two winners of the contest held by middle schools in Moscow. The contest was entitled: How I Understand China. The visitors from China were winners of a Russian language contest held in Shanghai.

The performances in our country staged by the Chinese artists who came to join the celebrations on the 40th founding anniversary of the PRC were a big event in the cultural life in our country. The Chinese artists gave

concerts in Moscow, Leningrad, Minsk, and Alma Ata to the warm welcome of Soviet audiences.

In 1989, a veteran fighters' delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society visited China. The delegation was led by Arkhipov, former leader of the collective of Soviet experts who is now First Deputy Chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. Members of the delegation included those who took part in the Chinese War of Resistance Against Japan and those experts who helped China to restore and develop its economy in the first few years following the October 1949 victory of the Chinese revolution. For some of the delegation members, it was the first visit they had made after an interruption of almost 25 years. The delegation met with Chinese leaders as well as workers, peasants, and intellectuals. The result of these meetings proved that the people of the Soviet Union and China are determined to develop their friendship and cooperation in various fields.

Our reporter asked: An agreement on the projected 1990-1991 cooperation between the friendship societies of the two countries was signed last autumn. What are the basic characteristics of this agreement?

[(Minov) is briefly heard in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] (Minov) said: The plan calls mainly for cooperation between the experts of the two countries. The Soviet Union will send leaders of its factories and agricultural units and young experts in various fields to China. On our part, we will receive [words indistinct] delegations from China. The plan also calls for new ways of cooperation, such as festivals and gatherings of people from various circles. We hope that contacts between the Soviet and Chinese friendship societies will continue to increase and be consolidated.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Foreign Minister Continues Visit

Abe, Lukyanov Reach Accord on Ties

OW1701042790 Tokyo KYODO in English 0202 GMT
17 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan. 16 KYODO—Japan's former Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe and Soviet Vice President Anatoliy Lukyanov agreed on Tuesday to promote balanced expansion of bilateral ties between the two countries, Japanese officials said.

Abe and Lukyanov also reached accord on promoting exchanges between Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and the Soviet Communist Party.

The former LDP secretary general met Lukyanov, first vice chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, shortly before leaving Moscow for home. Lukyanov renewed President Mikhail Gorbachev's pledge to "use wisdom" to settle a long-standing territorial dispute over four Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido, the officials said.

Abe thanked Lukyanov for attending the state funeral of Emperor Hirohito, posthumously renamed Emperor Showa, in February last year.

Abe visited the Soviet Union Saturday through Tuesday as head of a seven-member LDP delegation.

Abe Leaves for Home

OW1701010890 Tokyo KYODO in English 2350 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, Jan. 16 KYODO—Former Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe left Moscow for home Tuesday, ending a 4-day visit to the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

Japanese Politician Welcomes Dialogue

LD1601153590 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Tokyo January 16 TASS—The beginning of a dialogue between the Soviet Communist Party and the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan has been welcomed by Liberal Democratic Party General Secretary Ichiro Ozawa.

Speaking at a news conference here today, he said that "this is a very good factor for progress in relations between the two countries."

Commenting on the results of the Moscow meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and the head of the Liberal Democratic Party's delegation Shintaro Abe, he stressed that the dialogue became possible due to both sides' realization of the need for a flexible approach to the development of Soviet-Japanese relations. "I think there is sufficient ground to consider the meeting a success," Ozawa said.

General Secretary of the Japanese Cabinet of Ministers Maumi Moriyama said at a news conference in Tokyo today that Abe's Moscow proposals to broaden economic relations between the two countries did not imply changes in Japanese foreign policy.

Sakhalin Historian on Outlook for Kurile Islands

OW1501031090 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0930 GMT 15 Dec 90

[V. Feoktistov video report; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A unique exhibition entitled "Kurilskaya—New Findings" has opened in the Sakhalin Oblast regional studies museum.

[Feoktistov] This is the 11th time since 1978 that archaeological expeditions of the museum have visited Urup Island in the Kurile Archipelago where all these years research has been carried out at the ancient Kurilorossiya settlement. [video shows map of the

Kurile Islands with old Russian flag, photo displays, and artifacts on show at exhibition]

The results obtained by the archaeologists are of enormous scientific value, and in view of certain recent circumstances, they are also extraordinarily topical. [video cuts to show Feoktistov interviewing V.O. Shubin, the museum's deputy director]

[Begin recording] [Shubin] During the current field season we studied a relatively small area in the outlying areas of the settlement, some 200 square meters, and we found six domestic and economic structures there. Besides Russians, Aleuts also lived there, and we found very interesting evidence of a kind of eclectic culture that developed under the influence of Russian culture and on the basis of local traditions. [video shows various artifacts, including hunting implements, firearms, and religious symbols at the exhibition]

The Aleuts and Russians engaged in hunting marine mammals and so harpoons, heads of harpoons, special devices, remains of firearms, steel harpoons, and many domestic artifacts that characterize the material and spiritual culture of the Russian and Aleut population are on display at this exhibition.

[Feoktistov] Valeriy Olegovich, another question. Recently the people of Sakhalin and the Kurile islands have been literally swamped with all kinds of publications and television and radio programs with such expressive headlines as: "After All, Who Discovered [Otkryl] Sakhalin," "Should We Give the Kuriles to Japan," and "The Third Way"—meaning joint ownership of the Kurile Islands by the Soviet Union and Japan. [video shows the cover of GERMES, the newspaper of the Sakhalin Oblast Journalists Union, and SOVETSKIY SAKHALIN, the oblast party newspaper]

Now as a specialist, as a historian, what can you say about this?

[Shubin] The fate of the Kurile islands was shaped in such a way that the island chain became known practically simultaneously to Dutch, Russian, and Japanese voyagers. However, only Russia, at the very beginning of the 18th century in fact, was the first to begin developing the chain. One of the most important factors in the development of any territory is the organization of long-term settlements. From this point of view the priority is unquestionable. It was Russia, beginning in 1743 on Shumshu and then in about 1768 on Urup, that organized a whole system of Russian settlements.

These settlements were inhabited over a period of many decades basically without interruption until 1877. During the past 11 years we have received so much factual material attesting to life of the Russians in the Kurile Islands that it seems to me now to be quite absurd to even discuss the question of the Russians' rights to this territory. The islands were thoroughly inhabited and developed.

On the other hand, in light of contemporary events I have to say—rather, I must mention—that the present tenants [khozyayeva] of the Kurile Islands have, without a doubt, not been very lucky. What we now see on the Kurile Islands is not the very best option. That is why I imagine that a lot of thought must be put into this sphere; many ways must be sought, particularly in the spirit of the new course that has been adopted in our country in general. This is an extremely promising direction, extremely promising. [end recording]

ROK Effort To Ease Cocom Restrictions Noted

SK1701091090 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Jan 90

[From the "Businessmen's Club" program]

[Text] The Republic of Korea will make efforts to ease the discriminative restrictions imposed by the Coordinating Committee for Export to Communist Area. According to a YONHAP report quoting what is said by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, this matter will be discussed at the regular U.S.-South Korean trade consultative meeting to be held in June this year.

Agreement Signed for ROK Joint Venture Plant

SK1701091390 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Jan 90

[From the "Businessmen's Club" program]

[Text] I will talk a little bit about the practical relations between Soviet enterprises and their ROK counterparts. The first Soviet-ROK joint venture enterprise will be established in Amursk in the Far East. The manager of the (?chemical) plant, (Polimer), and the representatives of a (?ROK) company signed the agreement to produce microwave ovens. Some will be sold in the Soviet Far East and the rest will be supplied to third countries.

Economic Ties With ROK Enhance Area Security

SK1601094590 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 6 Jan 90

[Text] The new economic ties that the Soviet Union established last year with foreign countries demonstrate that they have provoked a great deal of reaction among (?working) officials in the countries concerned. The establishment of enterprises in various parts of the Soviet Union, including the Soviet Far East and Siberia, and a plan to expand ties with all the countries in Asia and the Pacific require that the Soviet Union improve its relations with the ROK.

The (?rapid) growth in the volume of trade between the (?Soviet Union and the ROK) is (?an indication of the substantial ties in the future). In recent years, it was through the third countries that the Soviet Union and the ROK could have been able to promote their ties. But during 1989, the two countries were able to develop these ties directly.

What kind of [words indistinct] during 1989?

A station reporter asked Andrey (Rodzanov), a (?commentator) in the general bureau of international (political) and economic affairs at the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry, for an answer to this question.

[Begin (Rodzanov) recording fading into Korean translation] According to an agreement reached between the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Korea Trade Promotion Corporation, the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry opened its mission in Seoul on 1 April 1989. In the meantime, the Korea Trade Promotion Corporation officially opened its mission in Moscow on 7 July. [end recording]

So said Andrey (Rodzanov).

Timed to coincide with the opening of the ROK mission, (Eksportimport), [word indistinct] of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry, organized an exhibition of ROK goods in Moscow, the first of its kind. In the exhibition, 13 leading ROK companies put mechanical products, [word indistinct] consumer goods, and other goods on display. During the exhibition, economic ties were established between Soviet enterprises, trade organizations, and ROK companies. There was also a seminar on scientific affairs. In the process, Soviet economic organizations and enterprises spoke about the successes attained in the ROK economy and its future prospects.

Toward the end of July last year the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry received a visit by the delegates of Korean businessmen organized by the Federation of Korean Industrialists [FKI], the first of its kind. The delegation, headed by Chong Chu-yong, honorary chairman of the FKI and Hyundai Group, made trips to Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, Nakhodka, and [name indistinct] ports. The delegation was composed of leaders from 28 big business firms, banking institutions, and other economic organizations. In these ports, these Korean business leaders discussed ways to strengthen working cooperation in the course of meeting with leaders of enterprises and economic institutions in both Khabarovsk and Primorskiy Kray. The Korean side paid particular attention to business firms in these areas with which they can cooperate and to the establishment of their own economic zone in the (?soviet) krays.

In July, the Korea-Soviet Economic Association was formed with Chong Chu-yong as its leader. This organization was composed of Korea's leading economic institutions, including the country's big business firms and [name indistinct]. This association was given the job of performing economic cooperation at the non-governmental level and other coordination.

The Korea-Soviet Economic Association and the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry discussed ways of [word indistinct] and working cooperation. They exchanged views on ways of establishing direct economic [word indistinct].

Another economic cooperation council is now being formed, whose mission is to assume the role of a basic coordinator for the activities of the Soviet side for the development of working-level relations between the ROK companies and Soviet enterprises and organizations.

Despite the difficulties on the Korean peninsula, the speed of growth in the trade of goods between the two countries last year was fairly high. According to the statistics released by the ROK, for the first 10 months in 1989, it amounted to \$423 million, which is nearly twice as much as that in 1988. Weaving industrial goods, electronic appliances, rolled (?goods), and (?repair) of ships, which amounted to (?\$20 million), constituted the major components of the exports from the ROK. The Soviet Union exports [words indistinct], coal, and fishery goods to the ROK. However, the level that has been achieved does not preclude potential growth in view of the economy of the two countries.

The next question the reporter asked was, "What do you think is the basic direction of the economic relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK?"

(Andrey Ravoynov), a Soviet joint venture expert, says that the representatives of such Soviet firms as [names indistinct] will go to Seoul to [words indistinct] with the ROK. In the early part of 1990, six major companies of the ROK, namely Hyundai, Samsung, Lucky-Gold Star, Daewoo, Ssangyong, and Kohlon, will be stationed in the Soviet Chamber of Commerce. The mutual (?stationing) of the major trading firms under the sponsorship of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce will help further strengthening of the organizational base of the economic relations between the two sides, adding to their efficiency and vitality.

The (?first round of) the economic meeting, which we proposed to hold in the first quarter of 1990, will be an important stage in the activities of our council. It is planned that a Soviet national exhibition will be held in the ROK in the fall of 1990.

The ROK has a strong economy. The ROK is expected to become the 10th largest industrial state this year. The close economic relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK have the mission of making an important contribution to the strengthening of peace and security in the Far East and East Asia. Therefore, the activities of the economic representatives can be regarded as a positive step to improve the situation on the Korean peninsula and to contribute to the dialogue between Seoul and Pyongyang.

Imports From ROK Rise by Over 400 Percent

PM1601110590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Item from column of TASS, REUTER, UPI reports: "Increase in South Korean Exports to the Soviet Union"]

[Text] In the first 11 months of 1989, South Korean exports to the Soviet Union increased more than 4 times in comparison to the same period in the previous year. A report by the South Korean Ministry of Trade and Industry published in Seoul indicates that in the period January through November last year, supplies of goods from this country to the Soviet Union reached \$141.5 million in value terms which is 455.5% higher than the figure for 1988. South Korean imports from the Soviet Union rose by 122.2 percent, to reach \$359.8 million.

Hyundai Group Opens Company in Nakhodka

*SK1701091290 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[From the "Businessmen's Club" program]

[Text] The world-famous ROK Hyundai Group has opened its company in Nakhodka, a port city in the Far East. This will contribute to further strengthening the reciprocal economic relations between the two countries.

'Winds of Change' on Korean Peninsula Discussed

*SK1401110290 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1100 GMT 11 Jan 90*

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] It appears that the winds of change blowing in the political lives of the East European countries have begun to affect the situation on the Korean peninsula as well.

News agencies are carrying reports on the new attitude toward settling the Korean question, which has been very prolonged and acute.

Our station commentator (Sergey Petrov) says in this connection:

It is very difficult to reach a conclusion about the changes taking place in the political life in this region. However, these facts can be cited as changes: dialogue between the DPRK and the United States, which is being held through a councillor of the DPRK Embassy and a councillor of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing; the news report that ROK President No Tae-u has accepted DPRK President Kim Il-song's proposal for free mutual visits between the people of the North and South; and some reduction anticipated in the scale of the U.S.-South Korea "Team Spirit" joint military exercise.

The ROK side desires to develop direct trade with the DPRK.

These facts make it clear that a concrete shape has begun to develop in settling the Korean question, on which discussion has been virtually blocked until recently due to mutual (?animosity) between the parties involved in the conflict.

However, in general, there still remains a hint of uncertainty even in the wake of such affirmative changes. Above all, the ROK's clear attempt to beef up its military potential can be cited.

Only recently, an agreement has been reached with the United States to equip the South Korean Air Force with 120 F-18 fighters; dialogue is under way with England to buy Hawk trainer aircraft; and there is an ongoing plan to test domestically produced ballistic missiles. Judging from these facts, I think our listeners can understand the situation.

Incumbent officials may cite the withdrawal which may take place in South Korea as a justification for their military buildup. However, this assertion is not persuasive when the practical and peace-oriented trend developing in Pyongyang toward easing tension in this region is taken into consideration.

The Korean peninsula is still an area of high military danger. Therefore, military buildup by one side will force the other side to seek a countermeasure. Then the Korean question will return again from the political field to the military field.

Is the South Korean military buildup necessary to such a degree? Or do they think that they can gain the advantage in future dialogue? These questions are automatically raised.

I would like to ask about the true (?intention) of the United States and South Korea, and about news reports on a willingness to deal with the DPRK on an equal footing.

Positive Signs Mark Recent ROK, DPRK Moves

*SK1701075590 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1100 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] The leaders of the DPRK sent a new proposal for the reunification of Korea to the South Korean president, prime minister, and the leaders of the opposition forces. Station commentator (Igor Lebedev) states in an article welcoming this proposal:

By this step Pyongyang demonstrated its readiness to explore a new way to solve the problem of reunifying the country, the national problem of the Korean people. Pyongyang proposed to the South Korean side to hold a joint meeting of parliamentarians to push ahead with the preparatory work for the meeting of the high-level authorities. Prior to this, as has been reported, Pyongyang put forward an important proposal to pull down the concrete wall installed along the Military Demarcation Line which separates the North and the South, to allow free visits by Korean residents, and to totally open the door for North-South contact in political, economic, and cultural fields.

This proposal met with an affirmative response from the South side. President No Tae-u, welcoming this proposal, put forward a proposal for a high-level meeting

between the North and the South, which is a most efficient way to improve relations.

It leads us to conclude that progress is seen in [words indistinct]. Meanwhile, reunifying the divided nation is not simple. The fact that the U.S. troops equipped with nuclear weapons are stationed in South Korea constitutes a great obstacle. Pyongyang proposed that the U.S. troops withdraw from South Korea by 1992. However, Washington is not planning to begin such a troop withdrawal, under the pretext that the stationing of the U.S. troops contributes to the promotion of security in Korea.

Judging from all facts, Seoul agrees with Washington's opinion. In the talks between the defense ministers of the United States and the ROK scheduled for February, the issue of the U.S. troops in South Korea will be discussed. The development of dialogue between the two sides of Korea and the alleviation of military and political tension in the Far East calls for the withdrawal of the 43,000 U.S. troops from South Korea.

The anticipated direct dialogue between the North and the South to discuss the issue of reunification is promising for the development of relations between the two sides of Korea. It is well known that the Korean people are greatly interested in reunification. A poll recently taken by the (?Yonsei) Research Institute showed that 90 percent of those who participated in the poll were greatly interested in reunification. The solution of the issue of reunification, the basic national problem of the Korean people, will undoubtedly be beneficial to the strengthening of not only peace in Korea but of overall security in the Far East. The Pyongyang proposal is oriented in this very direction.

Scale-Down of "Team Spirit" Exercise Viewed

SK1501122390 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 12 Jan 90

[Commentary by commentator (Igor Levezhev)]

[Text] During his New Year's press conference, South Korean President No Tae-u said that the "Team Spirit" U.S.-South Korean joint military exercise will be scaled down this year. Commentator (Igor Levezhev) writes:

I think that the Seoul authorities have made a very important decision. How extensively the military exercise will be scaled down is not known. Only the fact that a decision has been made in this direction has been [word indistinct]. This is because the militaristic frenzies which have been kicked up every year on the Korean peninsula—to be exact, in South Korea with the mobilization of a total of approximately 200,000 troops of South Korea and the United States—have significantly aggravated North-South relations and have become a major obstacle to normalizing North-South Korean dialogue.

The purpose of the "Team Spirit" exercise has not changed at all: to defeat the so-called aggression from the

North. However, in reality, the "Team Spirit" exercise has always been of an aggressive nature. An exercise involving launching a nuclear attack against the enemy country is conducted during this exercise, and what they mean by the enemy country is, surely, the DPRK. The scale of the "Team Spirit" exercise, which bears a very close resemblance to an actual war; the operations to transport U.S. troops from the U.S. mainland and the Pacific for this exercise; and the alert status of the 600,000 South Korean troops have only aggravated tension in this area and have worried the countries [words indistinct].

The (?Pyongyang) [word distinct] has opposed the "Team Spirit" military exercise and has correctly evaluated it as the provocative display of the military strength of the United States and the Seoul regime. As you know, the DPRK leadership decided not to conduct large-scale military exercises as early as (?June) 1986. Pyongyang decided not to conduct military exercises during a period when it is holding talks with South Korea and has put this decision into practice.

The South Korean leader publicly declared that he had decided to scale down the "Team Spirit" military exercise. However he only said that he would scale it down, not stop it. Still, this will reduce threats of war prevailing on the Korean peninsula. I think that not only the Pyongyang (?leadership's) consistent peace-loving policy but also the positive change of the situation in Asia and the international situation in general have made the leader of the (?current administration) take this measure.

In Asia, new thinking and the people's aspirations for cooperating with each other not in a confrontational atmosphere but in a peaceful atmosphere are growing as time passes. It is all the more necessary in Korea to remove the atmosphere of distrust because Korea has been artificially divided for more than 40 years. To solve Korea's major national issue of reunifying the country, we must remove all the atmospheres of distrust.

Cultural Centers Pact Signed With DPRK

PM1201135990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Tikhomirov dispatch: "Extensive Scope for Activity"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 11 Jan—An agreement has been signed between the Soviet Union and the DPRK to set up a USSR Cultural Center in the DPRK and a DPRK Cultural Center in our country.

It is envisaged that both centers' spheres of activity will be very wide-ranging—from various exhibitions and movie shows to the organization of libraries and Russian and Korean language courses. But the main aim in setting up the centers, which will open in Moscow and Pyongyang—as O Mun-han, vice chairman of the Korean Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign

Countries, put it—lies in comprehensively promoting the strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the two countries' peoples.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

UN Security Council Holds Talks on Cambodia

Background to Meeting Noted

*BK1201084690 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia
1500 GMT 11 Jan 90*

[Station commentary]

[Text] A meeting attended by representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council is scheduled to be held in Paris on 15 January. As was announced earlier, the meeting is scheduled to hold talks on ways to solve the Cambodian problem.

The representatives of the upcoming meeting do not hide their concern over the situation in and around Cambodia. It is clear that they have postponed other important appointments, and have decided to sit down at the negotiating table in Paris to enable them to achieve tangible results in the efforts to solve the protracted Cambodian problem.

News coming out of Cambodia shows that the Khmer Rouge group is launching a new offensive, which is deliberately timed with last week's celebrations marking the liberation of Cambodia from the Pol Pot clique. The Khmer Rouge group has attacked a number of government posts along the Thai border. It has also tried to attack Battambang, the second largest city in Cambodia, and to launch terrorist activities in the country's capital. Grenade explosions have killed and injured several persons.

The Khmer Rouge radio has given different versions of these events; it has described them as continuous victories on the battlefields to the extent that they have almost achieved their goals. However, these reports are far from the truth. Western news agencies openly said that such Khmer Rouge reports are highly exaggerated. In response to the Khmer Rouge's self-inflated claims, diplomatic circles in Bangkok find it difficult to believe that the Khmer Rouge will be able to capture Battambang. The massive foreign assistance will not enable the Pol Pot forces to gain a decisive superiority, but it will make them more brazen and will in turn create further tension. Casualties among military and civilian people will increase. It is high time that all this is stopped. Many people raise this question. It is obvious that the Cambodian problem cannot be solved through military means.

Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas, who is now visiting Bangkok to hold talks on the Cambodia problem, said that the time has come for the warring factions to stop confrontation and return to the negotiating table. It is noteworthy that Ali Alatas has contributed much to such efforts. In the past, it was Ali Alatas

himself who had initiated several talks on Cambodia, and now he has proposed the convening of the third Jakarta informal meeting to enable the concerned parties to hold constructive dialogues. Thanks to Ali Alatas' efforts, preparations to hold such a meeting have achieved concrete results.

While in Bangkok Ali Alatas expressed support for an Australian proposal to solve the Cambodian problem, which had in turn elicited a wide-ranging international response. In short, the essence of the proposal is that Canberra calls for the establishment of a UN administration in Phnom Penh to monitor the implementation of agreements and to supervise general elections, which will decide the future administrative system in Cambodia. The proposal also calls for the vacating of the Cambodian seat at the United Nations.

In fact, the Australian deputy foreign minister is currently on an extensive overseas tour aimed at explaining the details of the proposal. The tour is reported to have brought about positive results.

All concerned parties, including the Hun Sen government, have in principle agreed to the Canberra proposal. Khmer Rouge ringleaders like Khieu Samphan are the only ones that have opposed the proposal by insisting that they participate in the provisional administrative agencies. Such a stand, accompanied by a military offensive against the Phnom Penh government by the Pol Pot forces, is self-explanatory.

Against the backdrop of the Khmer Rouge's precondition, next week's meeting in Paris is well timed. The meeting will discuss the Canberra proposal and other initiatives, which will encourage efforts to solve the Cambodian problem. However, it is hard to believe that the Paris meeting will remove all obstacles which have obstructed the efforts. It is hoped that the meeting will contribute toward efforts to resume direct dialogue among the concerned parties.

Rogachev Participates

*LD1701100790 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT
17 Jan 90*

[Text] Paris January 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Sorokin:

A meeting of deputy foreign ministers of the five permanent United Nations Security Council member-states ended in Paris on Tuesday [16 January]. It examined questions of a Cambodian settlement.

The Soviet side was represented by Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev.

During the meeting, the sides discussed prospects for a peace settlement in Cambodia, taking into account all initiatives put forth in the recent past.

Participants concentrated on the possibility of holding free and fair elections in that country under U.N. control and preparations for them.

They were unanimous in the opinion that no acceptable solution of the problem can be achieved by force and that peace can be established only through a general political settlement, including the verified withdrawal of foreign forces from Cambodia, a ceasefire and the cessation of outside military assistance to the warring sides.

The meeting agreed with an enhanced U.N. role in a Cambodian settlement and pointed to the urgent need for stepping up diplomatic efforts to achieve this settlement.

These conclusions were recorded in a document approved by the meeting. It also noted that the aim of a settlement is self-determination of the Cambodian people by holding "free, fair and democratic elections" under direct U.N. administration.

The meeting participants believe that the U.N. should also play a considerable role in the transition period to ensure internal security in the country.

The document points to the desirability of an early resumption of a dialogue between all the Cambodian sides to simplify the settlement of problems concerning the transition period.

The meeting participants supported all efforts to work for a settlement on a regional level and expressed readiness to establish permanent contacts with interested sides to recall the Paris conference on Cambodia.

An understanding was also achieved to hold regular meetings of the five permanent U.N. Security Council members on a Cambodian settlement. The second meeting of the five will be held in New York late in January and the third—in Paris in mid-February.

They will continue the discussion of specific steps on a political settlement of the Cambodian problem, taking into account an enhanced U.N. role.

According to the Soviet side, the Paris meeting was a breakthrough in efforts to resume the negotiations and gave considerable impetus to achieving a compromise and a peaceful settlement of the problem.

Efforts To Settle Cambodia Conflict Viewed

*PM1601145190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Own correspondent B. Vinogradov report: "Cambodia: Around the G. Evans Plan"]

[Text] Phnom Penh—When Phnom Penh's inhabitants had celebrated their national holiday 7 January, they switched their attention to reports from the diplomatic fronts, which are generating optimism once again for improvements.

After a 2-day meeting held in the provincial city of Svay Rieng with Australian Deputy Foreign Minister Michael Costello, Hun Sen, head of the Cambodian Government, held a conference with the country's leadership and informed it of the results of the talks during which the Australian plan for a settlement put forward by Foreign Minister Gareth Evans was discussed in detail.

It is well known that the main points of this plan are proposals for UN participation in creating an international monitoring mechanism and in preparing for elections around the same formula which was used and yielded positive results in Namibia. Hun Sen's government was the first to state its principled support for this plan, but it proposed holding another series of consultations with the aim of pinpointing individual formalities and comparing all sides' positions.

Taking into account the complexity of the situation and the acuteness of the existing contradictions, it was decided to have preliminary discussions about Canberra's initiative with all the interested parties. M. Costello, who as G. Evans' special envoy recently visited a number of countries including China, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Cambodia and then set off for Paris, took on this mission. What are the preliminary results of his mission?

It would be difficult to answer this question unequivocally because everything is in a state of flux. Great hopes are being pinned on a meeting of representatives of the five states which are permanent members of the UN Security Council to be held, so it is proposed, next week in Paris. Put as for the internal aspect of the Cambodian problem, some observers are already making predictions. In any event, after conversations with Costello each of the four Khmer sides basically advocated support for the Australian plan. This primarily means bringing UN international forces into Cambodia to maintain peace, creating a commission to take care of the cease-fire and foreign military aid, and participating in free elections.

The biggest differences, as expected, were over the section concerning the forms of the country's administration in the transition period—that is, from the moment the cease-fire comes into effect until the creation of the new government. Now three versions are being outlined: disbanding both governments (meaning the current government of the State of Cambodia and the government of so-called Democratic Kampuchea in exile) and putting the country under UN administration; maintaining the existing administrations during the preparations for and holding of the elections; and persuading the four sides to agree to and determine a provisional mechanism "on a patriotic basis."

So, observers believe, thanks to the diplomatic steps taken recently, favorable conditions are emerging for the normalization of the situation and for the gradual elimination of the conflict.

But optimistic forecasts and diplomats' encouraging efforts, apparently, are in no way influencing the progress of military actions in Cambodia's northwest regions. Reports continue to come from there about fierce fighting around Battambang—the country's second-biggest city. Everything indicates that the opposition forces want to utilize this period to seize as much territory as possible, so that later they can conduct the political haggling in Phnom Penh "more cogently." The flames of war are spreading ever wider, and an urgent decision is needed to stop deliveries of weapons to the conflict region altogether. And people believe here that if the "meeting of the five" in Paris makes this decision, it will make a great contribution to a settlement.

Svay Rieng Accords Welcomed

PM1601150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent P. Tsvetov dispatch: "Svay Rieng Landmark. Quest for Ways To Settle the Cambodian Problem Continues"]

[Text] Svay Rieng-Phnom Penh—Svay Rieng, a small, cozy city and center of the province of the same name 100 km to the east of the Cambodian capital, unexpectedly came within the purview of journalists and politicians last week. An event occurred here which could possibly become the latest step in the quest for a way out of the deadlock in solving the Cambodian conflict.

On the morning of 7 January a mass rally was held in the city to mark the 11th anniversary of the country's liberation from the genocidal Pol Pot regime. Hun Sen, chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers, delivered a long speech there. Then consultations began between the head of the Cambodian Government and M. Costello, Australian deputy foreign minister, who had made a special trip to Svay Rieng.

The Australian envoy's mission (he had previously had meetings with representatives of the Cambodian opposition and some other sides involved in the conflict and before that, last December, had visited Phnom Penh) was to discuss questions linked with settling the Cambodian problem peacefully. The sides concentrated their attention on the question of the UN role.

A month ago Hun Sen issued a statement in which he acknowledged the possibility of a full-scale UN role in a Cambodian settlement. This time the unanimous opinion was reached in Svay Rieng that the United Nations could take part in the Cambodian internal administration during the transitional period with a view to ensuring that free and just elections are held in the country, provided that Cambodia's seat in this organization was left vacant. The sides acknowledged that such participation could take various forms. These will be determined by future meetings and conferences between the interested parties.

Thus, the State of Cambodia has confirmed its positive attitude to UN participation in a Cambodian settlement although, of course, it is ridiculous that representatives of the so-called coalition government, which has no support among the Cambodian people and has been condemned by them for its past criminal actions, have hitherto held a seat in a highly prestigious international organization.

There is no doubt as to the sincerity of the intentions of Hun Sen and his government. In the last 3 years since the proclamation of the national reconciliation course, it has frequently compromised and demonstrated good will in order to secure the speediest resolution of the problems. Suffice it to recall such acts as the reduction in the timeframe for the definitive withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodian territory, the change in the name of the state and the flag, and the constitutional amendments. The adoption of these decisions was in many respects brought about by opposition demands. But how did the latter respond to Phnom Penh? With new totally unwarranted claims (including the demand for Hun Sen's government to be dissolved) and with the escalation of military operations.

The start of the new year was heralded by the continuation of the fighting in provinces bordering Thailand. In the first week of January the Cambodian People's Armed Forces, repelling opposition gangs there, put out of action approximately 170 enemy officers and men.

You get the impression that there are many elements within the opposition, above all Pol Pot supporters, who are not halting their attempts to resolve the Cambodian problem by military means and overthrow the government in Phnom Penh. They refuse to seek political solutions.

The Cambodian knot cannot be untangled with weapons in hand. A settlement can only be secured by peaceful means. The accords secured in Svay Rieng will perhaps be landmarks on this path.

Philippine Economic Situation Surveyed

HK1701034190 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] President Corazon Aquino has expressed confidence that the Philippines' gross national product will increase by 6 percent this year. Looking back at the country's GNP last year, which rose by 3.6 percent, economists predict a further rise in the GNP. What will cause this increase? It involves the government's capital investments and the bundling of various private structures.

Meanwhile, the government continues to hope for more foreign investments, which is why President Aquino traveled to the United States last year.

The Aquino government's yearly finances are such that it has been necessary to cut down expenses for nonproductive enterprises. Meanwhile, signs of loosening the terms involving the country's foreign debt are becoming evident. Manila has been able to reach an agreement with foreign commercial banks which agreed to reduce the required payment of (\$41.3 million) by one-half.

In this regard, Finance Secretary Jesus Estanislao says that the government is hopeful of obtaining further agreements of this nature. Hence, the Philippines' foreign debt has declined from \$28 billion to \$27.2 billion.

Despite this, the Philippines' foreign debt remains the highest in Asia, when seen in per capita expenditure terms. In that 40 percent of the Aquino government's entire budget, of \$4 billion, has been set aside to pay for the debt.

Meanwhile negotiations with the United States continue, to determine how rental payments for the territory occupied by the military bases can go into the Philippines' hard currency reserves. It has recently been revealed that Manila has not received payments still outstanding from the Americans. The Aquino government has called on Washington to fulfill its responsibility, and it is also urging the Americans to purchase food supplies for the bases from the Philippines. Such negotiations, if successful, would help boost the Aquino government's hard currency reserves. Some of the other provisions contained in the Memorandum of Agreement signed by the Philippines and the United States in 1988 have not been followed.

What other issues are vexing the Philippine Government vis-a-vis its economic reforms? According to Fernando Delaño, head of the National Policy Planning Agency, further regulations are required to help boost the economy, upgrade the system which allows agricultural loans, stabilize prices, and maintain production levels. All of these depend on the country's internal stability.

However the present situation in the Philippines (brief break in transmission). In this connection President Aquino, in an address to the National Economic Development Authority, declared that the recent coup attempt has not grossly affected the country's economy. Still it is not certain that such an occurrence will not be repeated in the future.

Be that as it may, the Aquino government continues to seek ways to strengthen the country's economy, because to do nothing would result in disaster.

Pre-election Developments in Burma Described

RR1301104090 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT
12 Jan 90

(Aleksandr Nikolayev commentary)

(Text) It has been learned that a local elections commission in Yangon (Rangoon) has decided to allow Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, general secretary of the Central

Executive Committee of the National League for Democracy (NLD), to run in the parliamentary elections to be held in May. Moscow radio observer Aleksandr Nikolayev views the decision as very significant for the election campaign, as follows:

When Daw Aung San Suu Kyi was put under house arrest in July of last year, there were doubts about whether she would be allowed to run in the upcoming elections. Observers in Myanmar (Burma), as well as abroad, thought that the military government's sincerity in holding the elections would be determined by whether or not they allowed her candidacy in the elections. Observers were concerned that if Daw Aung San Suu Kyi were not allowed to run in the elections, the elections could not be considered to be reflections of the political sentiment in the country or to be honest elections.

The concerns grew when Labang Grawng, a Kachin national running as a candidate of the National Unity Party (NUP), the former Burma Socialist Program Party, in the same Yangon constituency as Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, objected to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's candidacy. He objected by saying that Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, who is the daughter of General Aung San, has connections with illegal organizations and is the wife of a foreigner.

A spokesman for an official students organization that fully supports Daw Aung San Suu Kyi said that if she is not allowed to run as a candidate in the elections, the people and foreign countries will lose confidence in the elections sponsored by the military government.

According to an earlier report, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi requested government liaison officials to register her party candidacy. It was also learned that the candidacy applications of two other members from the NLD, Ko Yu and Daw Sann Sann Nwe, were rejected.

TASS correspondent reports say that Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and seven other candidates from the NLD are either under house arrest or have been jailed without trial. Everybody also knows that former General Tin U, who is the Number 2 person in the NLD, had been sentenced to 3 years with hard labor.

However, the fact that the daughter of the national hero of Myanmar has been permitted to run in the elections in May is sure to enhance the integrity of the elections in the eyes of the ordinary people of Myanmar. Moreover, observers said that this decision is certain to enhance the prestige of the elections commission that has taken full responsibility for the success of the elections.

It is too early to know the election results and who will get a majority in the new parliament, but it can be shown that the NUP is the only party that has proposed and registered candidates to run in all the constituencies. Everybody knows that the NUP is strongest financially among all the political parties in Myanmar, and this has been a great asset, because a large sum of money is needed as deposit for the candidates.

An observer also notes that almost all prominent persons from the Burma Socialist Program Party have been submitted as candidates by the NUP. The NLD, which is thought to be the main opposition to the NUP, managed to submit a candidates list two-thirds the size of the NUP's.

The leaders of the NUP speculated that their party will win over Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's party in rural areas that did not partake in the 1988 disturbances. The Democratic Front for National Reconstruction Party also speculated that they would win the support of farmers. In a recent press conference held by the front, it is quite clear that their party has received support from individual farmers. Former Brigadier General Aung Myi, who sent open letters of criticism to the government of the ruling Burma Socialist Program Party in Yangon in 1988, is also running for the new parliament.

General Saw Maung indicated in his speech, aired by the Voice of Myanmar, that because of the various motivations of the many political parties and candidates, they have caused an unprecedented political situation. He also pointed out that the situation could lead to the destruction of national unity and sovereignty, and he urged the Defense Services to always be alert.

The general also confirmed that the Myanmar Defense Services have no intention of keeping power for a prolonged period and that they would hand over power to the duly-elected government. Furthermore, he declared that the upcoming elections will be a historic event, changing from one political system to another. He also suggested to the candidates that they should not give vague promises to their constituents. The general remarked that heavenly promises were made to the people that they will get democracy, freedom, and human rights. But the people should think about whether they will really get what they were promised after the elections are held.

Near East & South Asia

Iranian Delegation Leaves Following Visa Talks

LD1601221290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2035 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan (TASS)—An Iranian delegation headed by Tatch Masule, head of the Islamic Republic of Iran Foreign Ministry Visas and Passports Department, completed its work and departed for home today. The delegation has been conducting talks on questions of tourism and on easing border travel and exchange for citizens of both countries.

Drafts of a memorandum of mutual understanding between the governments of the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran concerning the conditions of mutual trips by citizens of both countries to relatives and on private business and also of an agreement between the USSR and Iranian governments on simplifying the

procedure for the crossing of the state border by citizens resident in border regions have been handed over to the Iranian delegation.

The draft memorandum provides for simplifying the mutual trips of citizens of both countries, in particular those trips that are undertaken to see relatives, to take part in traditional holidays, to visit graves, and also the trips undertaken in other cases, where leaving or entering a country is caused by considerations of a humanitarian nature. Specific timeframes for completing the formalities of exit documents, following written applications from citizens, are being defined. Exit and entry will be made on the strength of passports through the existing checkpoints open to international passenger traffic.

The draft agreement concerning the simplified procedure for border crossings by Soviet and Iranian citizens permanently residing in the border areas provides for their crossing the border on the strength of their national identity cards with an appropriate insert giving them the right to multiple use. Crossing the state border will be done through posts that have been built especially for these purposes.

At the end of January this year a Soviet delegation will go to Iran to continue talks and to sign the documents referred to above.

Vorontsov Briefs Envoys on Azerbaijan Situation

LD1601173990 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian
1830 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Yuliy Vorontsov, the first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, met and conferred with the ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Nasser Hejran-Norani, and the ambassador of Turkey in the Soviet Union yesterday. In the course of this meeting, Vorontsov informed them of the order approved by the Soviet Presidium to declare a state of emergency in several regions of Azerbaijan, including the border areas with Iran and Turkey.

Soviet Mideast Stance Reiterated on Talks Eve

LD1601180390 Moscow International Service
in Arabic 1500 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Aleksy Zlatorunskiy commentary entitled: "On the Eve of the Meeting in Washington"]

[Text] MENA reported that the Egyptian delegation, headed by Egyptian Foreign Minister 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, left today for Washington. This delegation will participate in the U.S.-Egyptian-Israeli talks, which are scheduled to begin in the U.S. capital in the latter part of this week.

MENA pointed out that Baker's plan will be the focus of attention for the participants in the meeting.

This plan specifies the organization of a direct Palestinian-Israeli dialogue as a first step toward settling the Middle East conflict. Some Israeli ministers are now in

the United States holding preparatory consultations with the representatives of the U.S. Administration.

The positions of three participants in the Washington meetings are known in principle. These positions contain more points of contradiction than of agreement. Anyway, this is true for Egypt and Israel. But we cannot infer from that that the talks between the foreign ministers of Egypt, Israel, and the United States will not have positive results.

The Soviet view on this matter is clear and well known: that an international conference on the Middle East held under UN auspices and with the participation of all the concerned parties, including the PLO, on an equal footing, should be the final step toward a settlement in the Middle East. However, this does not negate the other methods, especially during the preparatory period. These include direct bilateral talks—that is, the Palestinian-Israeli talks. If this bridge could be extended in Washington, then it would be a very pleasant matter, because another step would have been taken toward solving the conflict in the Middle East.

Aleksiy Zlatorunskiy says: Only one thing worries me, as it worries many political observers. Let us assume that the Palestinian resistance movement includes two or three alternative and equal organizations. Naturally the main point they would like to discuss in Washington should be: With whom should the talks take place, and which one should be given preference. However, there are no other organizations. Only one organization exists: the PLO, which is represented in the majority of the international organizations, and which is recognized by the international community. The PLO is considered the only Palestinian organization which can decide anything, whether Israel and Washington like it or not. Is it not logical to discuss the following issue: On what basis should the talks take place?—not with whom the talks should take place. The results will be better for all sides if they consider this issue: On what basis should the talks take place?

Arab League Chief Welcomes Moscow Proposal

LD1401100590 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT
12 Jan 90

[Text] Tunis January 12 TASS—Secretary-General of the League of Arab States (LAS) Chedli Klibi has welcomed the Soviet offer to host a meeting of the Iranian and Iraqi foreign ministers.

He described the Soviet Union's initiative as important and emphasized that Moscow would play an important role in efforts designed to promote peace and security, and settle regional conflicts.

Klibi expressed hope that the Soviet initiative would open a new era of understanding and accord in the region and mark the beginning of a lasting global peace reached on the basis of the Security Council Resolution 598.

PLO Welcome for Moscow Mission Upgrade Noted

PM1601113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Amman, 13 Jan—Faruq Qaddumi, leader of the PLO Political Department, has welcomed the Soviet Union's decision to transform the PLO mission in Moscow into the Embassy of the State of Palestine.

"This step," he said, "illustrates that the Soviet Union is building its relations with the Palestinian people at state level."

In an interview with JORDAN TIMES, F. Qaddumi once again emphasized that the stubborn Israeli and U.S. rejection of PLO participation in the Palestinian-Israeli talks does not serve the cause of peace but only exacerbates tension in the Near East.

The head of the PLO foreign policy department expressed the hope that the countries of East Europe will continue to support the Palestinian people's just struggle for their legitimate rights, above all the right to create their own independent state.

Noting the positive changes in West European countries' stance on the Palestinian problem, F. Qaddumi welcomed Europe's striving to hold an international peace conference on the Near East under UN auspices.

'Arafat Cables Gorbachev

LD1601001490 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Palestine Liberation Organisation chief Yasser 'Arafat has expressed gratitude to Mikhail Gorbachev for the decision to accord embassy status to the PLO mission in Moscow.

In a message addressed to the Soviet president, 'Arafat emphasized that this important political and diplomatic move demonstrates the Soviet Union's solidarity with the Palestinian people in their struggle to put an end to the Israeli occupation and create an independent national state.

The decision to exchange ambassadors meets the interests of both peoples and the task to bring a just peace to the Middle East and enhance international security, 'Arafat said.

More on 'Arafat Message

LD1601173590 Moscow International Service
in Arabic 1300 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has received a message from Yasser 'Arafat, Palestinian head of state and chairman of the PLO Executive Committee.

In his message, 'Arafat addressed his sincere gratitude to the CPSU leadership and the Soviet state for their decision to raise the status of the PLO mission in Moscow to a Palestinian Embassy, provided that the Palestinian ambassador to the Soviet Union is accredited by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet ambassador is accredited by the PLO Executive Committee.

The message pointed out that this important political and diplomatic step is another proof of the continuing Soviet solidarity with the Palestinian people in their just struggle to end the Israeli occupation and establish an independent state. It also indicates the increasing international support for the Palestinian peaceful initiative, ratified by the 19th PNC [Palestine National Congress] session.

The decision to exchange ambassadors reflects the strength of Soviet-Palestinian friendship and constructive cooperation. The decision also responds to the interests of both peoples and to the duty of establishing a just peace in the Middle East and of consolidating international security.

Yasir 'Arafat wished Mikhail Gorbachev health and every happiness, and wished the Soviet people progress and prosperity.

Sharayev Heads CPSU Delegation Visiting Syria

*LD1601093890 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT
15 Jan 98*

[Text] Damascus January 15 (TASS)—A delegation of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) visited Syria in keeping with a plan [words indistinct] between the CPSU and the Arab Socialist Renaissance (Ba'th) party. The delegation was led by Leonid Sharayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Auditing Commission and party chief in the City of Nikolayev, the Ukraine.

(?During the) visit, the delegation was acquainted with the work of the central apparatus of the Syrian ruling party and visited a number of administrative districts.

The delegation was received by Ba'th Deputy General Secretary A. Al-Ahmar.

On Monday, the delegation left for home.

Meets With Ba'th Official

*PM1601141590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6*

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Damascus, 13 Jan—'A. al-Ahmar, deputy general secretary of the Ba'th Party, received a delegation of CPSU party officials headed by L.G. Sharayev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and first secretary of Nikolayev Oblast Ukrainian Communist Party Committee.

The participants in the meeting expressed satisfaction at strengthening Soviet-Syrian party and interstate ties based on common aims of establishing a just peace in the region.

Delegation Returns Home

*PM1601144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Visit to Syria Over"]

[Text] Damascus, 15 Jan—A CPSU delegation headed by L.G. Sharayev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and first secretary of Nikolayevsk Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee, has visited Syria in accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Ba'th Party.

During the visit the delegation members familiarized themselves with the activity of the ruling Ba'th Party's central apparatus and visited a number of the country's provinces.

The CPSU delegation members were received by 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant general secretary of the Ba'th Party, and questions of mutual interest were discussed.

The delegation returned home today.

10-Year Trade Protocol Signed With Egypt

*LD1301150190 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT
13 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—Talks between Soviet and Egyptian businessmen that ended here today resulted in the signing of an intergovernmental trade protocol for 1990 and in the coordination of a programme for cooperation between the Soviet Union and Egypt in the coming ten years.

"The beginning of January has been eventful in the field of Soviet-Egyptian trade and economy relations. Three Egyptian government delegations visited the Soviet Union," Boris Nuri-Zade, the Soviet Foreign Economic Relations Ministry's chief specialist for cooperation with Egypt, told TASS.

The intergovernmental protocol envisages the growth of trade between the two countries by approximately 4 per cent compared to last year.

The export of machinery and equipment from the Soviet Union for facilities which are under construction or are being modernised with Soviet organisations' assistance will also increase.

Soviet lumber, [words indistinct] are of considerable interest to the Egyptian economy. The Egyptian side will boost the delivery of consumer goods, for example, sewn and knitted goods, carpets, furniture as well as food-stuffs—citrus fruits and onions.

The coordination of a long-term programme for economic, trade, scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries has been the result of the recently concluded first session of the subcommission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation of the intergovernmental Soviet-Egyptian commission.

An agreement is expected to be signed during the Egyptian president's official visit to the Soviet Union in March 1990.

The sides discussed an increase in the number of Soviet specialists working on cooperation projects in Egypt, terms for their dispatch, and conditions for the admission of Egyptian citizens to Soviet educational establishments.

'Idiosyncratic' Al-Qadhdhafi Ideas Noted

PM1201135190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 12 Jan 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin report under the "Travel Notes" rubric: "Sweet January in Tripoli"]

[Excerpts] Tripoli, Moscow—The question of the trip to Libya arose suddenly and was resolved without delay. By invitation of the Libyan side, I was to attend a press conference given by Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. By lunchtime the next day I had arrived at Tripoli airport, having covered 3,600 km in 4 hours and 20 minutes. The change from the cold Moscow winter to the sweet warmth of the African Mediterranean coast would probably send any Russian into raptures. Add to this the green vegetation and a highway as smooth as glass lined, at intervals, with stalls of citrus fruit laid out for sale. Finally, there was "Al-Jawdah," a modern hotel from whose windows you can enjoy the sight of light modern buildings looming against a backdrop of sky and pale blue sea. [passage omitted]

During the years since the overthrow of King Idris in 1969, Libyan society has been qualitatively transformed thanks to the huge revenues from the sales of petroleum. There are no poor or destitute people. Everyone has been provided with housing. Free medical services are available. Libyan specialist cadres are being trained at foreign universities. Per capita income is many times the figure for other African countries. Although I would not say that this is very noticeable, judging by the external appearance of the capital's inhabitants. Presumably one of the reasons is the embargo on deliveries of consumer goods from the United States and other Western countries. Despite a certain liberalization of domestic political life and a more flexible foreign policy on the part of Tripoli, the embargo remains and the West continues to view Libya with wary suspicion, accusing its leadership of supporting terrorist groups in other countries.

In these circumstances what M. al-Qadhdhafi probably needs is greater understanding. Nor was it difficult to guess the motives for the press conference which he organized, for which more than 100 foreign journalists

had gathered. The date of the press conference had been announced, but until the last moment the guests did not know its time and venue, waiting in their rooms or the hotel lobby in anxious expectation. Suddenly there was a flurry of activity. Buses pulled up and the column moved across Tripoli just as dusk was falling. Some 20 minutes later we arrived at some kind of fenced-in and guarded installation, in front of a large tent in which everything was ready for our meeting with M. al-Qadhdhafi....

He appeared, in national costume, in the company of athletic-looking guys, responding affably to the applause, and giving photographers a few minutes to do their job. He then began to speak clearly, in a calm voice, leaning back slightly, and focusing the attention of his audience on the most important issues by raising his index finger and returning to individual points again and again.

I have invited you, he said, in order to share my thoughts on what is happening in the world. First about the changes in East Europe, which can be described as peaceful revolutions testifying to the awakening consciousness of peoples. Unfortunately, not everywhere did these changes take place without bloodshed. In Romania, for instance, there have been considerable casualties. It is to be hoped that this can be avoided in the future in this or any other socialist country....

The statement took about an hour. M. al-Qadhdhafi's manner reflected his absolute faith in the infallibility of his views. Why do peoples reject capitalism? Because it leads to war, lawlessness, and unemployment. Why have the peoples of East Europe rejected the existing model of socialism? Because, as a rule, it was based on the diktat of a single party. True democracy can be guaranteed not by parties and parliaments which keep changing, but by people's committees and people's assemblies. That is, by the jamahiriya system, toward the establishment of which the world is heading.

In the opinion of the Libyan leader, the revolutionary processes in socialist countries are not yet completed. The danger remains that they may veer toward a path of development on the Western model. And he warned the peoples of East Europe against possible mistakes during the present period.

Explaining his stance on the "Jewish question," M. al-Qadhdhafi said that a reappraisal is currently under way of everything connected with the outcome of World War II. The Berlin Wall is coming down, and Moscow has condemned the secret 1939 treaty. And the so-called state of Israel, as the Libyan leader put it, was, after all, also spawned by World War II and is an injustice in respect of both Palestinians and Jews. According to M. al-Qadhdhafi, the Jews must quit Palestine and return to the countries from which they emigrated as a result of oppression. He cited Alsace Lorraine, the Baltic region, Alaska, and the Volga region as possible territories where a Jewish state could be set up.

A highly idiosyncratic view, I would say. The state of Israel is a historical reality. The solution to the Palestinian problem is to be sought not in the "relocation" of Jews to Alaska or wherever, but in a quest for a sensible compromise which would accommodate both peoples.

At the end of his meeting with journalists, he answered their questions. There were many who wanted to address the leader personally. They formed an impenetrable circle around him. What are Al-Qadhdhafi's views on Papandreou and U.S. bases in Greece? Does he still think that young people must fight a U.S. military presence by means of arms? However, eventually the passions subsided and everyone headed for the buses.

At the airport I bought a sticker for 3 dinars to attach to my flight ticket—a charge every passenger must pay to fund the construction of a "large man-made river, a grand water main from the depths of the Sahara." "The water will irrigate the land and bring happiness to the Libyan people"—that is the local view. Well, as the saying goes, may Allah help them!

Afghanistan Urges West To Reopen Embassies

*LD1401121290 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT
14 Jan 90*

[Text] Kabul January 14 TASS—A spokesman for the Afghan Foreign Ministry welcomed the decision of France to resume the functioning of its embassy in Kabul.

He assessed the action as a step towards stronger and broader relations between the two countries.

Having pointed out that Afghan authorities reliably ensure the safety of foreign diplomatic representatives in Kabul, the spokesman urged other Western countries, too, to reopen their embassies in the Afghan capital.

The embassies' staff had been evacuated from Kabul on the eve of the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops on the plea of "lack of safety guarantees".

Several days ago joint detachments of the opposition, Pakistani servicemen and Saudi mercenaries, supported by artillery, attacked the forward defence positions of government troops in a number of districts of Paktia Province and also shelled the city of Khowst and its outskirts.

As a result of air strikes and artillery attacks by the Afghan Army, the enemy was rolled back, losing about 450 men killed or wounded. A large amount of arms and transport vehicles of the rebels was destroyed.

A meeting of clergy, elders, members of reconciliation commissions, and commanders of units of regional troops took place in Paktia.

The participants reaffirmed their support for the peaceful policy of the country's leadership and considered matters aimed at drawing various tribes more widely into efforts to ensure peace in areas inhabited by them.

In accordance with a decree by Afghan President Najibullah to give urgent aid to the population of the country's northeastern provinces, the distribution of wheat, vegetable oil, sugar, and chemical fertilizers has been started in some areas of Konduz.

Preparation is under way in Takhar, Badakhshan and Baghlan provinces for the reception and distribution of prime necessities.

A group of Afghan children, who had suffered from rocket bombardment, arrived in Kabul on Saturday [13 January] upon taking a medical treatment course in the Federal Republic of Germany.

In all, 119 Afghan children had been sent to the FRG and more than 70 of them have already returned. Another group of Afghan children will be sent to the FRG for medical treatment soon.

Afghan Envoy on Success of Reconciliation Policy

*LD1201214190 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT
12 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—By TASS correspondents Igor Agabekov and Andrey Novikov:

The national reconciliation policy proclaimed in Afghanistan on January 15 three years ago is an illustration of the Afghan leadership's new political thinking, an expression of the people's will and desire for the consolidation of all progressive forces, for the development of peace and democracy in the country, said Murtaza, Afghan charge d'affaires in the Soviet Union.

Now, when attempts by Afghan rebels to impose their will on the legitimate government have fully collapsed, one can sum up the results of this policy, Murtaza told TASS.

The Geneva accords, which defined a new approach to the solution of the Afghan issue, are certainly among the important results of efforts in this direction.

The Afghan Government has advanced a number of specific initiatives to facilitate the formation of a coalition government, a multi-party system and even changes in some government structures.

The new election law, land reform, freedom of trade under a new economic policy and the development of the private sector in the national economy—are all part of transformations in the country.

The national reconciliation policy, Murtaza stressed, meets with ever growing support both inside and outside the country. This is illustrated by the decision on solidarity with the Afghan people made at the non-aligned

forum in Belgrade, the resumption of French-Afghan diplomatic relations and the readiness of some Western governments to agree to contacts with the Afghan leadership.

Najibullah Blames War on Foreign Interference

*PM1201160390 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 12 Jan 90 First Edition p 3*

[TASS report: "Najibullah: 'We Have Stood Our Ground'"]

[Text] Istanbul, 11 Jan—The main reason for the continuation of the war in Afghanistan is foreign interference, above all by Pakistan and the United States, President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan said in an interview with the Turkish newspaper TERCUMAN. Despite the painful blows the war has inflicted on the country's national economy, we have stood our ground, both from the military viewpoint and in economic terms. Just as in any other revolution, mistakes were committed in implementing the tasks of the April Revolution in Afghanistan. However, we have worked persistently to rectify them.

Time 'Working in Favor' of Kabul Government'

*PM1201145790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7*

[APN correspondent A. Pravov dispatch for PRAVDA under the rubric "Afghan Encounters": "Winter in Kabul"]

[Text] Kabul, Jan—In January snow finally fell in Kabul. It came as an unpleasant surprise for drivers, causing serious problems for traffic in the city. In the mornings the streets are covered with ice and it is unsafe to drive until almost noon. However, in general the city's inhabitants welcome the snow. After all, it heralds a good harvest.

Food prices in the markets still remain high. Vegetables, fruit, and rice are unattainable for many of Kabul's inhabitants. Delivery difficulties are the main explanation. The armed detachments of the "irreconcilable" opposition are doing their utmost to block the road from Hayraton to Kabul and to create food shortages in the capital. However, government troops are also doing their best to keep the road open. In general, the Kabul authorities are doing all they can to ease the situation of the people in the city. Thanks to the measures they have adopted, the prices for flour, fat, and sugar have gone down by 20-30 percent in recent days in the city's markets. More and more often it is possible to see crowds of people near fuel oil pumps previously deserted for quite a long time.

The mood of the city's people has also noticeably improved. A young soldier came up to me and said in Russian: "Hello. How are things?"—a traditional greeting on meeting Russians in Kabul. It turned out that

he recently graduated from a Soviet higher educational establishment and on returning home was immediately drafted into the Army.

It was obvious that Karim—that was the soldier's name—was glad of the opportunity to speak Russian.

"How would you describe the mood of your nearest and dearest?" I asked Karim.

"It is quite different from what it was a year ago," he replied without hesitation.

Then followed a relatively long monologue which can be summed up as follows. A year ago, prior to the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, many people were strongly influenced by the opposition propaganda. They were convinced that the USSR was an aggressor and that the members of the Kabul government were puppets. It was rather difficult to argue with these people, Karim went on. However, the situation has changed now. The "irreconcilable" opposition has not managed to score any successes over the past year. On the contrary, its prestige is waning, while Najibullah has appreciably strengthened his positions.

[Pravov] "What do you think would have happened if the opposition forecast had proved correct and the Kabul government had been defeated?"

[Karim] "In that case 1989 would have been the most terrible year for the Afghan people. There would have been chaos in the cities. No one could have defended their inhabitants from pillage and murder. The civil war would have flared up with renewed force. After all, the various opposition groupings are now fighting among themselves. They would have gone to extreme lengths to seize power."

[Pravov] "Do people realize that?"

[Karim] "The majority are beginning to realize it now. Time is working in favor of the Kabul government and the policy of national reconciliation...."

Karim and I parted, and approximately 2 hours later I was sitting in the office of Zahir Tanin, chief editor of the journal SABA'OUN, who listened with great interest to the account of my conversation with the serviceman.

"This is a highly illustrative encounter," Tanin said. "People are indeed beginning to view the situation which has taken shape in the country from this angle. This is borne out also by the letters which are arriving at the editorial office."

Zahir Tanin put the latest issue of the weekly AKHBAR-E-HAFTA on the desk in front of me. He is a member of its editorial board.

The latest issue is a jubilee issue. It is devoted to an analysis of the current situation in Afghanistan. Not just Afghan journalists, but also their foreign colleagues

express their opinions. Prominent scientists, diplomats, and lawyers have also contributed articles.

"Most of the authors," Tanin says, "are expressing precisely the thoughts on which your interlocutor insisted: Time is working in favor of the policy of national reconciliation. In my opinion Lyse Doucet, the BBC correspondent, makes an interesting comment. She writes that pessimism can often be encountered among the Afghan intelligentsia. But it is obvious that concealed behind it is a desire on the part of your interlocutor to convince himself of the reverse, to see his own theories destroyed. Many find it difficult to change the position they have held for the past 10 years. However, the tremendous changes which are taking place in society are not passing them by. The only way January 1990 resembles January 1989 is the snow covering the city. We are living in a different country today. It is impossible to ignore this."

Vorontsov, Pakistani Envoy Discuss Afghanistan

LD1601134190 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov received today Pakistani Ambassador to the USSR Abdus Sattar to discuss the Afghan settlement, the liberation of Soviet soldiers taken prisoner by Afghan rebels and some aspects of Soviet-Pakistani relations.

East Europe

CPSU's Yakovlev Meets GDR's Willerding

PM1701144790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Exchange of Information"]

[Text] On 16 January, A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with H.-J. Willerding, member of the Presidium of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS] Board and leader of the International Policy Commission, who is paying a brief working visit to Moscow. There was an exchange of information on the course of the restructuring processes in the Soviet Union and the GDR and the difficult tasks which the CPSU and the SED-PDS must resolve in the near future.

Great attention was paid to questions of deepening cooperation between the two parties on international questions and there was a discussion of the development of the situation in Europe. The importance of the struggle that the SED-PDS is waging to strengthen the independence of the GDR as a major factor for stability and peace on the continent was noted. There was an expression of Soviet Communists' solidarity with the

clear stance of the SED-PDS and other progressive forces in the GDR on the attacks by neo-Nazi forces in that country.

On the same day H.-J. Willerding had a conversation with V.M. Falin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

GDR Premier Notes Importance of USSR Trade

PM1201161390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 12 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the rubric "GDR People's Chamber Session: Government Statement by H. Modrow"]

[Text] Twenty points are included in the agenda of the 14th GDR People's Chamber session which opened yesterday in Berlin.

Attention was focused on the government statement made by H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

In the past 2 months, he said, there has been more democracy and freedom in the GDR, because of which the country has a historic chance which cannot be missed. The opening of the borders with the FRG and West Berlin gave rise to many hopes and fears. The situation in the GDR remains contradictory.

H. Modrow advocated continuing the constructive roundtable dialogue, appealing to all of its participants to make proposals concerning the forthcoming meeting between the head of the GDR government and FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, the GDR's further cooperation within the CEMA framework, public monitoring of progress to dissolve the departments of national security, and the formulation of legislation on elections and parties. But the roundtable ultimatums are not helping the activity of the cabinet of ministers, he stressed.

Touching on the GDR's economic position, H. Modrow described it as still strained. The state budget was completed with a deficit of M6-7 billion. Some 250,000 people employed in the national economy left the country last year, which to a significant degree was responsible for the fall in production in the fourth quarter and the increase in the disproportion between the producers of end products and their partners.

The prime minister described the GDR's trade with the Soviet Union as vitally important for it. A decisive role belongs to guaranteed, smooth export deliveries to the USSR on the part of all combines and enterprises to ensure the necessary imports of energy sources, raw materials, and other materials. The GDR is also striving to achieve a new quality of cooperation within the CEMA framework.

In the international arena the GDR confirmed the reliability of its policy and its predictability for its neighbors, the chairman of the Council of Ministers stated further. He stressed that the country's relations with other Warsaw Pact states are on the whole developing unhindered.

Touching on relations with the FRG, H. Modrow noted that many of the accords reached with it have already been implemented. The number of reciprocal trips by GDR, FRG, and West Berlin citizens has sharply increased. The GDR government realizes that GDR-FRG relations affect the main spheres of European and world politics. The GDR firmly adheres to its peace-loving policy and will not undertake anything which could affect stability in Europe. Its position on the question of the Oder-Neisse border is final. The unification of the GDR and the FRG is not on the agenda.

The deputies adopted a law on foreign travel which will come into force 1 February, and they gave a first reading to a law on the civil service.

K. Lueft, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, delivered the report substantiating the draft law on changes and amendments to the GDR constitution. The document legalizes the creation of enterprises with foreign participation. The new law will improve the prerequisites for the country's participation in the international division of labor, she stated.

A decision was taken on the recall of a number of deputies. The following former members of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] were among them: H. Kessler, E. Krenz, S. Lorenz, G. Schabowski, G. Schuerer, W. Eberlein, and W. Jarowinsky.

K. Wuensche (Liberal Democratic Party of Germany), H.-J. Lauck (SED-Party of Democratic Socialism) and P. Diederich (Democratic Peasants' Party of Germany) were elected as new members of the Council of Ministers.

Representatives of the opposition parties and organizations taking part in the roundtable work were present for the first time at the People's Chamber session.

GDR People's Chamber Debates Reported

*PM1601101190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent report: "Tension is Growing"]

[Text] Berlin—People predicted a dramatic outcome to the current GDR People's Chamber session. Interparliamentary tension in Hans Modrow's coalition government has become so acute that it is about to fall apart—FRG and West Berlin television commentators repeated the whole day before the session. An interview with Gregor Gysi, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism [SED-PDS],

who stated to a correspondent with Munich's SUEDE-DEUTSCHE ZEITUNG that he also does not exclude the possibility of the government's downfall, added fuel to the flames.

Hans Modrow delivered the government statement at the session. He appealed to all political forces to seek social accord in the country's interests. He proposed broad cooperation to the "roundtable" at which representatives of parties, movements and the church have gathered. He also appealed to the "roundtable" participants to put their proposals on the future law on elections to the forthcoming meeting of GDR and FRG heads of government.

On Monday, when the "roundtable" meets again, Hans Modrow will give its participants detailed information about the state of the GDR's internal security. Let me remind you that at the last meeting the "roundtable" almost ceased to exist on account of the opposition's dissatisfaction with the fact that an intelligence service and a service to protect the constitution have been set up instead of the disbanded department of national security. In all probability, on Monday heated discussions will flare up on this question.

In his speech Manfred Gerlach, acting chairman of the State Council, proposed that both German parliaments make a joint statement which would contain a guarantee of the inviolability of Poland's western border. This guarantee, in his words, would have decisive significance for stability in Europe. He assessed as dangerous the demand for the immediate unification of Germany.

The People's Chamber proposed holding parliamentary elections 6 May this year. It ordered the State Council to start preparing for them. The draft electoral law was published. It will be adopted after a referendum is held. The draft excludes privileges for any parties or organizations.

Those deputies who spoke at the session talked about the need to formulate and adopt a new constitution for the country—individual amendments and additions are obviously not enough to ensure the process of revolutionary changes in the GDR.

The deputies adopted a law on foreign trips and abolished the provision whereby the number of workers in private artisan enterprises and workshops is limited to 10 people.

During the second half of the day there was a demonstration near the People's Chamber building in which tens of thousands of Berliners participated following an opposition appeal. They demanded that property belonging to the SED and the former ministry of state security be handed over to the state. The demonstrators carried placards demanding "the end of the SED." GDR flags and other symbols of the state republic were torn down from the People's Chamber building.

"What does all this mean?" the newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND asks in this connection. "Is this compatible with the culture of political debate, with democracy?"

SFRY Vice Premier Arrives for Mixed Committee
LD1401200190 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1721 GMT 14 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan 14 (TANJUG)—Vice-Premier of the Yugoslav Government Aleksandar Mitrovic (arrived) in Moscow this afternoon, where he will take part in the work of the Yugoslav-Soviet Mixed Committee for Economic and Scientific Cooperation until tomorrow.

Aleksandar Mitrovic is the president of the Yugoslav part of the committee.

The Mixed Committee will discuss the further promotion of the two countries' economic cooperation and Yugoslav's surplus in its trade with the Soviet Union and possibilities of resolving this problem as soon as possible.

Ryzhkov, Silayev Receive Mitrovic

LD1701040490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1900 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jan (TASS)—In the Kremlin today Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Aleksandar Mitrovic, vice president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, who is in Moscow in connection with the holding of the 27th meeting of the intergovernmental Soviet-Yugoslav committee on economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

As was shown by the exchange of information on the processes of social development in the USSR and the SFRY, the corresponding experience accumulated in the two countries is of interest to both, in many respects. This applies, in particular, to using economic methods to regulate the development of external links, demand and supply on the internal market, and levelling out balances of payments. It was noted that renouncing central planning cannot, of itself, of course, be a panacea against negative phenomena in economic development. This is shown, too, by the experience of Yugoslavia where the change-over to a market mechanism, which allowed some problems to be solved, also led to a worsening of others. As was noted by A. Mitrovic, the level of inflation in the country in 1989 was 1,225% and in order to curb the rise in prices the SFRY Government was obliged to go in for severe anti-inflationary measures.

Describing the problems of the Soviet economy, Nikolay Ryzhkov said that the way out was to be seen in the consistent implementation of economic reform, which in the current situation did not exclude decisive actions to overcome crisis phenomena. This concept was laid down in the government program of measures to improve the economy which was supported by the Second Congress of Peoples Deputies.

In the conversation, considerable attention was paid to the prospects for economic links between the USSR and the SFRY. It was confirmed that the governments of the two countries attribute great importance to developing and improving in every way the multifaceted Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation. They intend to tackle the problem of imbalance in reciprocal trade in such a way that this does not lead to a reduction in the level of trade exchange that has been achieved between the two countries. Moreover, mutual efforts will be directed toward insuring a further increase in the volumes of economic cooperation by means of nonstandard approaches.

Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Branko Zekan, federal secretary for finance; and Milan Vares, SFRY ambassador in the USSR; took part in the conversation, which passed in a friendly atmosphere.

'Social Tension' Seen Over Hungarian Price Hikes

PM1101103390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch under general rubric "Problems of the Day": "Hungary: What Is Happening to Prices"]

[Text] Budapest, 9 Jan—Food, cigarettes, beer and alcoholic beverages, motor vehicles, gasoline, rents, water charges, transport, postal services, and telephone charges—this is the range of the articles for which the Hungarian population will have to pay more in January and February. It is hard even to recall a similar massive onslaught on people's pockets. What has happened?

A decision to reduce consumer price subsidies has been adopted. In 1989 59 billion forints were spent on subsidizing producers of food products and a number of other consumer goods. If you add the rent subsidy, the total is 110 billion forints.

The reduction of subsidies holding down consumer prices will inevitably mean that food prices, for instance, become entirely free, based on demand, and subject to winter and summer seasonal fluctuations, the weather, and the vicissitudes of the harvest. A firm price will only be retained for one kind of pasteurized milk and one kind of white bread. Prices of meat and meat products will rise by between 30% and 42.6%. Upward fluctuations can be as high as 5%. On the other hand, meat and meat products are still being sold at the old prices in many stores. Since the enterprises themselves are in charge, some are going for volume of sales: If you sell more, revenue in fillers [1/100th of a forint] will mount up into forints. Nonetheless, the state budget is immediately gaining 19 billion forints by removing the agricultural subsidy.

On average, food prices will increase 32%. Prices of motor vehicles will increase 25%. Gasoline and diesel fuel will cost 3.5-4 forints more.

Many Hungarian economists believe that taking the brake off prices will lead to a wave of social tension. Although there are differentiated increases in pensions, child allowances are increasing, and regular social benefits to assist poor strata of the population are going up, all this may be nullified: Inflation (planned at 20% this year) is probably gathering pace. The government has not many levers left for influencing economic processes.

The Central Trade Union Council has described the situation as critical. S. Nagy, secretary general of the Central Trade Union Council, has proposed that industrial workers seek wage hikes already during the January wage negotiations. S. Nagy believes that such "bargaining" is currently hampered by the tax imposed on enterprises for the utilization of manpower and increased wages. Trade unions favor the abolition of this tax.

"Market prices, market wages!"—people are saying.

Risky Polish Economic Experiment Viewed

*PM1601201390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[L. Toporkov dispatch under the "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment" rubric: "Poland: Risky Experiment"]

[Text] Warsaw—"Good evening!" said the anchorman on the popular "Teleexpress" newscast, immediately adding: "Forgive me for saying 'good.'" Because what came next, as usual these days, were items about rampant inflation and other vicissitudes of the free market.

The first 2 weeks of the year in Poland, which is no longer described as people's Poland, have been characterized by popping eyes, as they say here. You can't help giggling when you read, for instance, that bread in Zielona Gora costs 6,000 zloties per loaf. There are no waiting lines, of course. In general, it has to be said that waiting lines are beginning to disappear. When I drive to get some gasoline, I can now see from afar that the pumps are deserted. As recently as December of last year there were kilometer-long lines. You now have to pay 2,400 zloties for a liter of gasoline, as much as a whole tankful cost 3 or 4 years ago.

Instead lines are forming where they had never been before, at the district administration transport departments. Car owners are handing in their license plates. They are deregistering their cars until better times return, so as not to squander money on gasoline, road tax, and insurance, which now cost a substantial sum. The number of cars on the streets is greatly reduced. Warsaw, where until recently traffic jams formed everywhere during rush hour, looks quite strange. Taxi drivers look glum as they wait in line...for passengers. People are not keen on hiring taxis. After all, the hire alone costs 3,000 zloties, and the figure shown on the meter has to be multiplied by 100 (in Lodz by 140, and in Szczecin by

150). To cross Warsaw from one end to the other costs 25,000 zloties. This is the price of a railroad ticket to Zakopane.

Incidentally, getting to the picturesque mountain resort is relatively easy. But who can afford to stay there? Schoolchildren's winter vacations have now started and normally they would head for Zakopane in their thousands and there would be a battle for every bed in boardinghouses and leisure centers. Now a single holiday voucher costs Z350,000-Z450,000. Prices of air tickets have risen sharply. A flight to New York, for instance, costs Z12 million and a flight to Sofia Z3-4 million. Only rich people can afford this.

Only they can enjoy meat and smoked meat products: A kilogram of these costs Z20,000, Z30,000, Z40,000 or Z50,000 (for your information: According to the current rate of exchange, Z10,000 is R6.94).

"A hungry Pole is an angry Pole," GAZETA WYBORCZA cites an old folk saying. "An ominous silence reigns in the countryside," it adds, analyzing the situation on the food market. Peasants, upset by what they see as the government's incorrect agrarian policy, are hanging on to livestock and waiting for a better market situation, because at the moment their labor and expenditure are not covered by the prices offered by meat combines and procurement centers for live livestock. They are forced to slaughter the animals themselves and take the meat to city markets. Fears have been expressed that many peasant farms will not be able to withstand the extremely high prices for fuel, fertilizers, agricultural machinery, coal, electricity, and feed, and will begin to reduce meat and milk production. A figure is being cited. This year more than 1 million peasant farms are expected to declare bankruptcy.

What is the problem? Many Polish analysts who are familiar with the agrarian question see the roots of this situation in the new ruling elite's ideology. It boils down to the revival of the folwarks, the big landowner estates which existed before the war. They may emerge in the place of the bankrupt small farms. It is no accident that legislation has been passed abolishing restrictions on the amount of agricultural land that can be owned. What is behind this? There is no need for special explanations: It is obvious that a peasant family today is not capable of tending 1,000 hectares of land, still less 10,000 hectares. Dozens of these families will be needed to do this work, but now in the form of hired labor.

Well known performers are making charity appeals on television. They keep repeating the same phrase: "Now that we are at last living in our own house..."—that is, we are no longer living under socialism. So since there is no more "socialism" and we are living in "our own house" can people be written off? This is what even "Solidarity" figures are beginning to ponder.

A curious gathering—a "Solidarity" seminar was held at the Warsaw University Economics Faculty. The subject of discussion was the government program to restore the

health of the national economy, the so-called "Balcerowicz Plan," named for the Polish deputy prime minister and minister of finance (IZVESTIYA has carried a report on the program). Lecturer J. Dziewulski delivered A report. Here are the key points of the report.

During the "roundtable" discussions the former opposition advocated economic pluralism and a mixed economy in which all sectors—state, private, and cooperative—would be on an equal footing. As soon as it came to power, the opposition changed its goals and set a course toward the restoration of capitalist relations in the country without asking the public for its consent. How can this be achieved swiftly, not over many decades but essentially in a year or two?

The L. Balcerowicz group, which is at the helm of the national economy, has proposed a very radical solution: free prices and a free dollar exchange rate, the elimination of subsidies, bankruptcy for the weak, unemployment, a decrease in the population's real incomes, and deliberate cranking up of the inflationary spiral. Why deliberate? In the group's opinion, inflation will help to achieve a market equilibrium more swiftly and achieve a redistribution in the national economy whereby the rich strata of the population will not only not suffer but are likely to benefit and thus to become established as the new class of entrepreneurs. The poor and helpless will sink into poverty. In other words, the tottering will be given a push.

The speaker declared that, in his opinion, the current leadership is pushing the people onto a road which appears to be too risky, incorrect, and most probably fruitless. The experiment could end in a vast economic and social drama. And a political drama too. The losses will be most unforeseen. "Solidarity" may perish, and society may lose faith in it and in the government which it put forward.

Poland is living through hard times. However, the biggest problems lie ahead, as they say.

Moldavian Delegation Leaves for Romania

*LD1501142390 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT
15 Jan 90*

[Text] Kishinev January 15 TASS—An expert group led by Nikolay Dudeu, deputy head of the Republican Planning Committee, left Kishinev for Bucharest today. The delegation plans to conduct talks on boosting relations between Moldavia and Romania.

"We are taking a large package of interesting ideas to Bucharest," Dudeu told TASS. "We seek to establish direct production relations, to set up joint ventures and to boost border trade between Moldavian and Romanian enterprises.

"We also have proposals on expanding scientific and cultural cooperation. The Kishinev City Soviet (Council)

proposed that an agreement be concluded to establish friendly relations and cooperation between Kishinev and Budapest."

It is also high time to simplify the procedure for mutual travel between Moldavians and Romanians, to remove all restrictions in this field and to open consular establishments in Moldavia and Romania, the Moldavian delegation head noted.

Daily Describes Moldavian Aid to Romania

*90UN0584A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 30 Dec 89 p 1*

[Article by V. Letov: "The Banks Will Come to Life"]

[Text] I am on my way to Ungeny, a rayon center on the Prut River. The only duty of the river is to serve as the border. I am on my way to the border with Romania which now has the right to be called "libere"—"free", free without quotation marks.

It is an hour of fast driving from Kishinev to Ungeny. A silver-latticed bridge connects the two banks. A passenger train from Bucharest just crossed the bridge. It was carrying some Soviet people who had found themselves, by mere chance, in the center of events—in the middle of a war. It was a war between light and darkness, between freedom and tyranny. One child, a diplomat's son, is showing a V-sign with his fingers through the train window—V for victory. Victory for everyone and for him too, as he is growing up.

Everyone knows that 22 December, the shortest day in the northern hemisphere, became the greatest day for the bright future of Romania—the day of victory over the Ceausescu regime. It also was a victory over the Romania of the past which used to holler frenzied "Long Live!" to the tyrant in its squares and halls.

I go to the Ungeny KPP-border checkpoint. Today it is a transshipment point and the checkpoint deputy commander, Major Bashkevich, says half-joking, half-serious that since 22 December he has been awake for every shift each day. All of Moldavia is sending trucks here and their cargoes are unpredictable. Sholdaneshty sent 52 tons of wheat, Chadyr Lunga sent sunflower oil, and Kotovsk sent flour. One sack bears a note: "20 wool blankets and 1-day's salary from the teachers and students of the Ungeny SPTY-70 [secondary vocational and technical school]". Mariya Sandulyak, a shift foreman at the transshipment point, is holding a long list of shipments—what goes where. The Kishinev Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] is sending medical supplies to Timisoara, the Moldavian People's Front is sending medical supplies too but addresses them to the Soviet Embassy in Romania to be directed to the hottest spot in the country.

The railway cars are full, they are full of kindness. Young Warrant Officer Vladimir Chaika, senior inspector at the

checkpoint, repeats to me the words of Simonov: "There is no grief that is not mine..."

After they come out of the torture chamber, your neighbors at first need your support. At such a time a slice of bread becomes more than something just keeping you from being hungry. In the evening our border guards were to meet with their Romanian counterparts: The meeting had been planned but the questions they were going to ask, had not. "Still?" was my question to Bashkevich and Bronislav Borisovich answered: "It goes without saying that we'll ask when the Romanian side will be ready to receive our people going there for pleasure or on business."

Blood is still being shed in the streets and all of a sudden a question like that, "The overthrow of Ceausescu's dictatorship," says the officer, "will help to intensify the contacts between relatives residing along both banks of the Prut as well as the cultural ties and all that will enrich our lives, because it is not on bread alone..."

That is true: Not on bread alone. I could not but notice the changes in the border rhythms. The notorious barbed wire is being cut. The local population is also taking control of the river lands together with the border guards. The people are also acquiring a new concern: They should feel at home not only in their own casa mare [big house] but on all of this land. On the banks of the Prut they are already putting into practice the idea of one, all-European home, where a smile serves to disarm you and to replace a machine gun. No obstacles will be put in the way of those who would wish to cross the river to visit their neighbors on this land.

"It is a nonsensical situation," a frontier post commander near Ryshkany told me, "if a man on the river bank cannot fish in that river. We are building our world on trust. And the banks of the Prut will come back to life."

NSF Leaders Deny Anti-Ceausescu Coup Planned

Ceausescu Terror Precluded Coup

PM1101171590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Romania Under Ceausescu: A Country Under Surveillance"]

[Text] Bucharest—An explosion of indignation which reduced the people to desperation, or a carefully planned coup carried out by the leaders of the underground National Salvation Front?

This question is occupying many minds, if not in Romania itself, then abroad. Especially after the French television program which tried to prove to the world public, using a video bought from some amateur moviemaker, that the members of the Front council knew one another well from the very first day of these events. According to the French journalists, the comments that

they exchanged among themselves such as "We have already agreed..." proved the existence of a conspiracy.

After watching the video, Romanian Prime Minister Petre Roman described it as an unscrupulous montage of shots from the first and second sittings of the National Salvation Front Council. Yet they were held on different days. Other members of the provisional government have spoken on several occasions of the spontaneous nature of the December revolution.

Nonetheless, could a powerful underground movement capable of toppling the hated regime have existed in Ceausescu's Romania? I believe that a short digression into the country's recent past will help answer this question...

Do not try to find in Romanian dictionaries the meaning of the words "turnator" and "filatura." The street gave them a meaning that corresponds with our "informer." No one knows how many people there were who cooperated with political investigation bodies out of fear or for a handout of 500 lei. At the same time, informing was encouraged in every possible way by a series of laws that have now been rescinded, like Decree No. 23 regarding contacts with foreigners. The authorities' increasingly frequent—particularly last year—appeals for an implacable struggle against blabbermouths, enemies of the people, cosmopolitans, foreign secret agents, and ideological saboteurs, who sought refuge in the guise of the local intelligentsia and certain foreign journalists, fueled an atmosphere of spy mania in which the repressive apparatus that had sprung up justified its existence. The number of Securitate men themselves (the officers and men of that apparatus), who were, according to some unofficial figures (there are simply no official statistics), more than three times as numerous as Romanian Army soldiers, has not been verified.

Anyone—Romanian or foreign—could, accidentally, often by false denunciations, or owing to a prearranged setup, become the object of persecution and political blackmail at any moment. Thus, a Hungarian diplomat fell victim to provocation 2 years ago. He was accused of distributing antigovernment pamphlets around Bucharest from his automobile. Romanian diplomat Mircea Recanu, son of one of the authors of the renowned "letter of the six," sent to Ceausescu last spring by prominent Romanian politicians, was arrested as a foreign spy. In an interview with NEWSWEEK magazine Ceausescu even proclaimed the actual authors of this letter, which caused a sensation in the West by accusing the dictatorship of discrediting socialism, to be USSR, U.S., British, and French agents.

Romanians are now saying a great deal overtly about the practice of opening and inspecting letters and tapping telephone conversations. It is said that, at Elena Ceausescu's suggestion, a special bugging service was formed in the mid-1970's, capable of tapping any telephone in the country. In addition, all photocopiers were controlled by security bodies. Typeface samples were taken

from every typewriter. A Romanian citizen could only buy an ordinary telephone with special permission from the authorities.

The December wind of freedom revealed many facts that showed the oppression under which Romanians lived throughout these years. Including those who were not afraid to be the friends of the author of these lines.

"I was frequently advised to meet with IZVESTIYA's correspondent. And ask him about the subjects of the articles on which he was working. And start up conversations on tricky subjects..." "A report was written about me... It said that I was engaged in speculation."

"Everywhere—in jail, during interrogations—we were shown at least 100 color photographs. Some were taken during receptions at the USSR Embassy. We were instructed to identify the IZVESTIYA correspondent in them," so say rights defenders and journalists A. Uncu and P.M. Becanu from ROMANIA LIBERE, which has maintained relations of friendship and cooperation with IZVESTIYA for many years, now that they have been released from imprisonment and exile.

I hope you have noticed that the aforementioned statements were made by different people. However, not everyone has yet brought themselves to give their name. I do not see anything surprising in that. The putrid stench of terror still hangs in the air along with the fear, which is receding into the past but is not yet extinct.

There were different penalties depending on the gravity of the "crime." For friendship with a Soviet journalist you could be fined or given the everlasting tag "movement restricted" and put on the list of suspects. It would, incidentally, be wrong to think that the blacklists are only the fruit of the latter years of Ceausescu's rule. Veteran Communist Kirile Panait said that even in the sixties he was arrested, beaten up, and then expelled from the party for giving an interview to IZVESTIYA's correspondent in Romania at the time. He spent 6 months out of work. The old partisan did not avoid the blacklists either. He told me that I. Iliescu, the incumbent chairman of the National Salvation Front Council, was also blacklisted. This automatically meant increased surveillance.

Attempts to tell the truth about the realities of the "golden age," as A. Uncu and P.M. Becanu did in an illegal newspaper, were persecuted most harshly. With imprisonment, beatings, torture, and exile. Isolation in psychiatric hospitals, false claims of unsuitability for their job, and dismissals with a reputation for unreliability were widespread. Economist Kostin Tsuguy [name as transliterated] endured all these aspects of the Ceausescu paradise for congratulating M.S. Gorbachev on his birthday each year.

"What is the crime in that, you may wonder," Kostin said. "But it was only later that I learned that all my cables were forwarded to the Securitate. I greeted

Mikhail Sergeyevich's arrival in Romania in 1987 in the Kula psychiatric clinic, in the Bucharest suburb of Popesti-Leordeni.

He was arrested right on the street 3 days before the Soviet leader's official visit to Romania began. Someone informed that Tsuguy had written about the situation in Romania and was trying to hand the leader of perestroika a letter.

At that time, Kostin told me, more than 160 people were in isolation in Bucharest. He met some of them in the psychiatric clinic. Dismissal from his job, a miserable pension, and psychological terror followed later.

"The same man met me every day on the street. 'Watch out that you're not run over by an automobile,' he told me in an undertone," Tsuguy said. "I could have gone right out of my mind. But then events erupted in Brasov."

Few people are probably aware that 7 people were killed and more than 200 arrested on 15 November 1987 when security forces dispersed a demonstration by Brasov workers. Many people with families were exiled from the area. Dissatisfaction flared up at the automobile plant then owing to the dreadful living and working conditions. In Brasov Romanians learned for the first time that the government had special troops trained to fight the people.

Indisputably, the harsh reprisals against the Brasov workers' demonstration opened not only Tsuguy's eyes to the real state of affairs in Romania. From then on the ruling clique continued to turn the screws in the notorious economy drive. The rationing system included more and more food products, sometimes even bread. Many daily essentials became commodities in extremely short supply. All this aggravated the people's dissatisfaction. Their muffled grumbling then began to surge up in hastily scribbled inscriptions: "Down with Ceausescu!" appeared on apartment block walls, in handbills, occasionally in the subway, on streetcars, and buses.

I still have one of the leaflets of the time. The size of a playing card, printed on a home-made printing press, it made the following appeal: "Citizens of Romania! Switch to Strikes! Sabotage Ceausescu's Initiatives! Unite to Fight for Your Rights!" Judging by the talk on the streets and by people's embittered faces as they stood in endless lines, it was indeed obvious that the number of malcontents was rising. However, the atmosphere of spy mania was being fueled in proportion to this, and surveillance of people on the blacklists tightened up.

"Virtually the entire country was under surveillance," Kostin Tsuguy reckons, "and there could be no question of any association of malcontents."

Moreover, in my view, people still retained the hope that, when the debts had been paid off, Romanians would be able to return to a normal life. However, this did not happen. Ceausescu decided to drown the next

peaceful demonstration after Brasov, in Timisoara, in blood. I think that the massacre—unprecedented in the history of modern Europe—only showed Romanians that the knife was at their throats and that there could be thousands more victims of the terror tomorrow. Timisoara was the last straw that snapped the people's endurance.

All that is true, but I cannot rid myself of the paradoxical thought that, if Ceausescu had not ordered the large rally to gather on Palace Square with a view to exposing foreign agents acting in Timisoara, no group of conspirators—even if it had existed—would have been able to bring the 2 million inhabitants of Bucharest, who had lived in an atmosphere of fear and terror for almost 25 years, onto the streets.

Brucan on Revolution

90UI0273A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 2, 10 Jan 90 pp 9, 14

[Report on interview with Silviu Brucan, chairman of the Commission on International Affairs of the National Salvation Front, diplomat, journalist, and political scientist, by Sergey Vashurin in Bucharest: "About the Romanian Revolution, Military Tribunals, and the Market"; date not given]

[Text] There are many rumors going around about the events in Romania, and a whole series of contradictory reports have appeared in the mass media. In order to resolve some of the vagueness, I turned to Silviu Brucan, president of the commission on international affairs for the National Salvation Front, well-known diplomat, journalist, and political scientist.

I had to pass through a guard post that included a tank and show my journalist identification several times, and afterwards there was a short check: To see if I had weapons—and now I am in the office of S. Brucan.

[Vashurin] Mr. Brucan, the Western mass media flashed a report that you said in an interview that at the time of your visit to Moscow you had consultations with the Soviet leadership...

[Brucan] I said only that I met with some of my Soviet friends in Moscow.

[Vashurin] Do your friends occupy high positions in the Soviet leadership?

[Brucan] No.

[Vashurin] Was it known in the Soviet Union what was to occur in Romania?

[Brucan] I knew nothing. I think that especially anyone outside the country could not have known anything. The people's revolt, which took the form of a social eruption, was unexpected both in its scope and in its violence.

[Vashurin] Some Western journalists, citing the Romanian military, assert that the revolt was prepared as early as May of last year...

[Brucan] As a newspaperman, I am amazed that serious publications in the West could "bite" on the scenario presented by French television.

We, the leaders of the National Salvation Front, would be very proud, if we could say that six months ago we planned everything and that the revolution was the result of our activity. But this simply is not true, and it is a great distortion of historical truth. The popular outburst was 100% spontaneous. And only under the fire which came down on the Central Committee building did the leaders of the Front meet for the first time. And it was only on the balcony of the Central Committee that evening were we able to discuss anything among us. The repressions of Ceausescu were not only terrible and cruel, but to an equal degree effective. No political activity existed inside or outside the party. I was under house arrest, and four agents followed my every step—practically total isolation. Masilu was also under house arrest—he was totally isolated. Agents followed Iliescu every day, wherever he was—home or at work. Under such conditions, any possibility of meetings and discussions of plans concerning a future revolt was excluded.

[Vashurin] How did it happen that precisely those people became members of the leadership of the FNS [National Salvation Front] who, pardon the pun, were members of it?

[Brucan] First of all, we knew each other. I am an old friend of Iliescu and Masilu... But, I repeat, we could plan no type of joint action. I personally tried to organize some kind of a movement inside the Communist Party. The first time was after people's actions in Brasov in November 1987. The second time was when I came out as the initiator of the "Appeal of the Six" in March 1989. But it remains a fact that not one of my actions had a serious influence on the Romanian Communist Party—neither on the level of the rank and file members, nor on the political leadership. In other words, it is entirely natural that in Romanian society the opinions of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] are associated with the leadership of Ceausescu, inasmuch as there was no noticeable protest movement or opposition to his criminal policy inside the party. That is why in Romania an end has been put to that communist party.

[Vashurin] How does your platform differ from the programs of other parties?

[Brucan] We will be the National Salvation Front. We have already published our program. It defines the main directions of our political activity. We intend on this basis to create our political preelection platform as well. The FNS plans to participate in the elections not as a party, but as a front, that is, a pluralistic political organization.

[Vashurin] After the revolution here, I did not hear the word "socialism." Does this mean that Romania will become a free enterprise state?

[Brucan] No, it does not mean this. First of all, I would like to say in this connection that it is premature to raise the question now about reforms. There is economic chaos currently in Romania. But can you really reform chaos?

I will cite only one example. Ceausescu told us that we have 60 million tons of grain. We could not even find 19 [million tons]. And this is the situation in any sphere of economics, politics, and social life. For the last 20 years everything in Romania was based on an enormous lie. Everything is false, and any official statistic is unreliable. Thus, first of all, we must put our house in order. We must recognize economic and social reality. And only on this basis can we begin the creation of a program of reform. I want to emphasize that one of the key principles in the activity of the FNS is economic decentralization and the gradual inculcation of the principles of market regulation in the economy.

Although we do not intend to make a fetish out of the market, we, however, know well that it is the most efficient stimulus for production. But at the same time, the market contains in itself tendencies to anarchy, which are expressed in inflation, unemployment, a reduction in the level of production, depressions, and so forth. Our intention is to use the market as a stimulus, but to attempt to control its negative aspects.

[Vashurin] What are the most important changes in Romania's international ties that you foresee?

[Brucan] I see one radical change in our foreign policy—and it is associated with the Helsinki process that is proceeding in Europe. As you know, under Ceausescu, Romania was a stumbling-block in the way of this process. We practically blocked the Vienna conference, the London conference on information, and the Sofia ecological meeting. A similar development of events should be stopped. Romania will make every effort to become one of the leading countries in the development of the Helsinki process, in the relations of all three "baskets"—disarmament, economic and ecological cooperation, and, of course, with respect to human rights. This is the most radical change that we foresee.

Second. We have to improve our relations both with the capitalist and the socialist countries of Europe. And starting now, the main direction of our policy will remain Europe. For Romania is first of all a European country, and we intend to proceed in our actions from this principle.

You, apparently, know that Ceausescu had hostile relations not only with Western states, but that tensions also existed with East European countries—Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, and even with the Soviet Union. So that we have to do a lot to improve mutual relations with East and West Europe.

[Vashurin] In many of your speeches, you talked about the fact that the Romanian revolution is a revolution of the youth. Where are these young people who participated in the revolt now?

[Brucan] The executive bureau of our council consists of 11 persons. Six of them are young people, starting with the prime minister, who is just a little over 40.

[Vashurin] Returning to the question of mutual relations with East European countries, what do you think, will Romania try somehow to resolve the problem of Transylvania?

[Brucan] This kind of question is not on our agenda. The Helsinki meeting of 1975 expressed itself quite clearly on territorial questions in Europe, and we think that everything will remain in accordance with its decisions.

[Vashurin] The military tribunals: For what purpose were they created?

[Brucan] We have to investigate and examine the affairs of many military or civilian persons who participated in the combat of recent weeks. The military tribunals will judge them.

[Vashurin] Don't these kinds of tribunals remind you of Stalin's "troika"?

[Brucan] We do not have "troikas." Tribunals always existed and continue to exist, involving themselves in questions that fall within their jurisdiction. They plead cases of terrorists who killed people, and of those who had a weapon and used it, and they do not have any relationship to civil matters.

[Vashurin] What could the Soviet Union do for Romania?

[Brucan] We expect some assistance from the USSR, especially in the supply of energy. And we, of course, want to exchange opinions, so that the Soviet Union is well-informed of our general plans. Is it possible that the Soviet side also wants this?

Roots of Deposed Ceausescu Regime Examined

90U10277A Moscow TRUD in Russian
10 Jan 90 p 3

[Article by Yu. Vasilkov: "The Cleansing: Reflections After the Romanian Revolution"]

[Text] The Romanian revolution, which broke out like a cleansing thunder storm at the height of this winter, without any exaggeration, shook the world. And although its logic blends in completely with the nature of the changes sweeping over Europe, there was a special depth in the Romanian events that compels one today to reflect on many of the commentators on foreign policy events. Some of them swear that they foresaw the collapse of the anti-popular dictatorship of Ceausescu. But, nonetheless, it was hardly possible to predict that it

would turn out to be so swift. It was literally yesterday that the position of the "conductor" was unshakable.

At the beginning of December, that is, barely more than a month ago, the world press was commenting animatedly on the results of the congress of the Romanian Communist Party which was held in November, and which became, in the words of the English newspaper THE TIMES, "a triumph of the general secretary." The American CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR asserted on 14 December: "The short-term outlook is that Ceausescu's control over authority is firm."

But it was almost the next day that the pyramid of absolute authority that seemed so firm crashed. The "golden epoch of Ceausescu," which Romanian propagandists likened to the most remarkable flourishing period of the state in its many centuries of history, ended in an inglorious death of the "author" on the merciless guillotine of a popular revolution, a sea of blood, and destruction.

It is noteworthy that this regime dressed itself up in the clothing of "real socialism," but that those who were revolting did not proclaim antisocialist slogans. In his last interview, given to the Iranian newspaper TEHRAN TIMES, N. Ceausescu shared his plans for "perfecting socialism." To the last minute of his life, if you are to believe the stenographic recording of the interrogation at the military court, he considered himself to be the spokesman of the interests of the working class.

At first glance, "we have already gone through this." Beginning with the sinister figure of I.V. Stalin to various formats of the lesser of his last-born children in one or another region of the globe. We have more than once disowned manifestations of Stalinism as having nothing in common with socialist ideas. But the lesson of last December compels us to reach new conclusions.

First of all, about the viability of tyranny. This phenomenon has accompanied mankind throughout its entire history. Is it accidental that in the 20th century autocratic regimes are coming to power with the help of socialist rhetoric more and more frequently? No, of course, this is a consequence of that broad popularity which the ideas of socialism and communism acquired at the beginning of the century. It can only be regretted that the means for their protection from absolute distortions were not found in a timely way.

N. Ceausescu did not become a dictator immediately, and to a certain degree it was not noticeable to himself. I think that, if in 1965, when the Ninth Congress of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] elected him general secretary of the party, some fortune teller had foretold that he was destined to turn into one of the cruelest European tyrants, he sincerely would have burst out laughing. A fundamental document, worked up with the direct participation of the general secretary of the RCP, was the "Program of the Romanian Communist Party to Build a Thoroughly Developed Socialist Society and To

Move Romania Toward Communism," which was adopted by the 11th Congress of the RCP in 1974.

But how imperceptibly a person is reborn under the influence of uncontrolled authority! Ceausescu gradually convinced himself of the infallibility of the decisions he made—for he was echoed not only by those around him, but acts of approval were organized on a country-wide scale. No one dared object, when he gave unlimited authority to his wife, and when he put his many relatives in responsible positions. The press also served him loyally to the end. I have before me an issue of the trade union newspaper MUNKA of 21 December. According to many years of tradition, it opens with a portrait of N. Ceausescu, who is talking this time with an Iranian leader. December 21 is precisely on the eve of that day when the general secretary was forced to flee from his palace from the anger of the people.

As it now becomes clear, an entire system was created for the careful screening of information that went "to the top." But, meanwhile, N. Ceausescu drove around the country a lot, "he met with the people," and he held teleconferences; that is, as we would say, he seemed to be working openly, and in close contact with life. But this did not disrupt his self-isolation. Here is just one example of how cleverly objective data were shuffled. According to the results of the agricultural year, figures were reported not on the harvest that was gathered in the field, but the percentage of the "norms" established from above. The statistics obtained through such machinations gave N. Ceausescu a reason to assert that in 1989 "the highest harvest of agricultural products in the entire history of Romania" was gathered. Meanwhile, the harvest of wheat and rye was lower by a factor of 2.5, and corn, by a factor of 8, than that which was reported to the "leader." The country has so little fodder today that there is talk of slaughtering cattle, which are low in number as it is.

Did Ceausescu believe the distorted information?

It can be said: It does not make any difference whether he believed or did not believe... The objective results of the policy that was conducted is what counts! But, it seems to me, that today it is no less important to understand whether an error was made in the selection of a leader, when a pathological personality was chosen, or did this pathology develop under conditions in which the leader found himself, or which he himself created. The large number of figures and destinies, which in one way or another can be compared with Ceausescu, nonetheless, incline one to the second conclusion.

And, you see, this is what puts one on guard: The system of uncontrolled one-man authority has been sharply criticized for a number of decades. And, nonetheless, we again and again run into its recurrences.

Here we come to a principal thought that is called forth by the bloody finale of "Ceausescu's epoch": On the one hand, any leader must one way or the other remain answerable to his people, but, on the other hand, the

need has arrived for stricter international control over adherence to democratic standards in individual countries, of course, without interference in their internal affairs. By the way, N. Ceausescu's signature is on the Helsinki Final Act. Nevertheless, as the Czechoslovakian newspaper RUDE PRAVO correctly notes, "Ceausescu was building his empire over the course of many years, while Europe adhered to a policy of noninterference." Moreover, the Romanian dictator was being treated kindly by many Western leaders for the policy he was conducting of "independence from the USSR."

But, you see, even in socialist countries, including the USSR, he was warmly received and even awarded high decorations! Although he was criticized at all levels for his anti-people policy inside the country and for his hypocritical behavior in the international arena. But he was criticized behind the scenes "for official use." They did not resolve publicly to express themselves even with respect to obvious distortions concerning all historical facts which were allowed not only in the Romanian press, but also in propaganda literature that was distributed everywhere from Romania...

The press, including TRUD, was silent until 20 December. But what could we say, when the unwritten rule prevailed: "In assessing the situation in a country, orient yourself on the position of friendship?!" It is now known what the position of Romanian friends was up until the second half of December 1989...

And what do we have as a result? The reader, as previously believing in the press, is once again astonished by the sharp turn in assessments. Of course, he quickly figures out what's what, and he can be helped in this by a frank and current explanation of the revolutionary events in Romania. But why was it necessary to arrive at such a stressful situation?

Was it not this artificially created propaganda vacuum and—as its consequence—outwardly unexpected "explosive" changes in the political situation that caused many people to feel that there would be a sudden collapse of the socialist community in East Europe? Meanwhile, as calm, objective analysis shows, the sincerity and depth of the relations of the Soviet Union with countries undergoing reform changes only strengthened. Because they freed themselves of everything oppressive, fictional, and hypocritical, which for a long time eroded the foundations of such a sacred concept as "friendship."

The changes in East Europe, and especially in Romania, compel us in the end to rid ourselves of the magic of words decisively. The communist and worker movement, including trade unions in countries that are being reformed, are going through a serious crisis. In many ways, it is caused by the fact that real life was concealed for a long time by the fetish of words. We seemed to be "developing cooperation" properly—but we did not get any of its fruit. "We were building socialism," and today this word is even expunged from the names of states.

Of course, it is difficult to attract people with a banner that dictators, who were corrupt and, moreover, untalented "leaders," used as a cover in order to sit on the necks of the people. The fact that until recently it was not permitted to disclose the shortcomings and the contradictions of socialism did not serve a good purpose. Ever louder voices can be heard about the total collapse of the socialist idea and the "return to capitalism."

But, it seems that when passions have abated, the word "socialism" will be rehabilitated and cleansed of the mud that has been thrown at it, for the reason that it denotes such a noble system of human values—good, freedom, humanism, and equality—which cannot "become antiquated" or "die."

Anticommunist Mood of Bucharest Rally Cited

PMLJ01154390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA special correspondents V. Vedrashko, Ye. Spekhov, and A. Sharyy dispatch: "Events in Bucharest"]

[Text] Bucharest, 13 Jan—The situation in Romania sharply deteriorated 12 January—a day when the country proclaimed a day of mourning in memory of those who died in the struggle against the dictatorship. At midday the prayers and mourning ceremonies which were held first thing, accompanied by marches played by military bands and the laying of wreaths on central squares, developed into mass demonstrations of a clearly anticommunist nature.

In the center of Bucharest thousands of townspeople lit funeral candles and brought bouquets of flowers to the places where street fighting had taken place. The rallies arose spontaneously, and everything pointed to the fact that the National Salvation Front was unable to direct and organize the events. This meant that the emotionally charged crowd will not stop demanding further radical political decisions.

The Romanian Communist Party [RCP], with which many Romanians identify Ceausescu's dictatorial regime, has discredited itself in the eyes of the people. This was also said in a statement published 31 December by an "action group comprising members of the RCP," which decided to hold an extraordinary congress with a view to the party's subsequent self-dissolution.

Given the population's sharp rejection of everything even remotely connected with the previous regime, Communists have been unable to propose any programs for the fundamental renewal of the leftist party; and indeed, this was clearly impossible—hatred of the dictator is too great. Hard as it may be to admit, by his crimes in the face of the people the dictator sullied not only himself and not even just the party, but also the idea. Are many people steadfast enough to believe in the desecrated ideals now?

Party membership cards were burning on the streets of Bucharest alongside the mourning candles. The fire turned the red covers to the ashen hue of the people's grief. It is agonizing to watch this fire. There was a young woman holding a blazing red booklet, tears running down her face—she had buried one of her relatives after the fighting...

There is no force in the country now, no person, who could convince the people that real socialism and "Ceausescuism" are not one and the same. They have heard lies for too long. The realization that there must be no revival of the old regime and that a return to the past is impossible has brought them onto the streets.

While among these people we sensed that in its few weeks in power the National Salvation Front has been unable to win most people's complete trust. "Are our 'free press' and allegedly 'free' television really free? The Front has usurped power." Such pamphlets can be seen everywhere in their hundreds and thousands. But, while rejecting the past, some people are once again demanding strong-arm solutions.

In the evening a rally involving many thousands of people and attended by the National Salvation Front leadership was held on Victory Square. The demonstrators demanded that all Communist-leaders be relieved of their posts, along with legislation outlawing the RCP and an accountability report from the Front's Council, and demanded that its chairman clearly determine his political stance with respect to the Communists. The Front leaders were unable to give a definite answer to these questions.

Representatives of the "Anticommunist League" which was set up recently, who are seeking repressive measures against Communists, seized the initiative. The rally took place in an atmosphere of extreme nervousness.

The situation was charged to the utmost. Thousands of young people plied in overloaded trucks between Victory Square and the television center, brandishing national flags and yelling slogans. Troops were assembled by the television center. Several shots rang out. Soldiers were ordered to prevent the demonstrators entering the building at any cost...

At this time an emergency session of the National Salvation Front Council was under way in the former Foreign Ministry building. The fate of the Communist Party was being resolved. The country's leaders appeared on the balcony. The RCP was outlawed. A decision was read out on holding a referendum 28 January on the question of reinstituting the death penalty as the supreme measure of punishment.

Soon after we had a talk with a young engineer, Dan Denescu.

"How do you feel at this time?"

"Relieved and...confused. I still can't quite express my attitude to what has happened. I recently heard the

following statement by a West German politician: 'We are delighted that Romanians have acquired partial freedom.' But what does the rest of freedom consist of? After all, it is one thing to talk and make demands, it is another to act. Look, people are in a state of euphoria. What will they demand tomorrow? I would like the unity that we see now to be preserved, but the range of opinions is too broad... There are few places where communist parties are banned. We should probably first take classes in democracy, at least for a few years. Once they have taken the floor, the masses do not always know what it is that they want to say. The threat of the resignation of the National Salvation Front was so obvious and tension rose to such a level that it seemed that the confrontation could develop into armed conflict. But what will happen next? For these people who hoarsely demanded the 'death sentence for communism' have no idea of the real nature of communism. I believe that there will be people who will fight for true communism and humane human ideals, once they have cleansed themselves of the filth of 'Ceausescuism'... I too was a party member. Of course, I share the general feelings. But if the people begin to vent their hatred of the former regime on all party members, I won't understand and accept that. The country has experienced a tragedy. We now want to build a society free from any diktat and from any insults to man's conscience and consciousness."

...One of the decrees of the country's new leadership was the recent decision to abolish the teaching of sociopolitical disciplines at higher educational establishments. They are to be replaced by a single subject "Concepts of Democracy." Dan Denescu is right: Democracy must be learned. The revolution has smashed the old and given rise to the new. The grim past is behind. Ahead lie the dreams of a shining future. But today there is a half-wrecked economy, debunked and desecrated ideals, and political vacillation.

At 0300 hours we saw the last groups of demonstrators disperse to their homes with their banners. In the morning Bucharest awoke in silence, as if weakened by the turbulent evening. What will happen next?

West Europe

Gorbachev's March Visit to Spain Uncertain

LD1601202990 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish
2000 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] At his office today Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez Ordóñez received Soviet Ambassador to Spain Sergey Romanovskiy. At the meeting, held at the Soviet ambassador's request and lasting half an hour, Romanovskiy briefed the Spanish foreign minister on his country's situation with regard to the nationalist conflicts in Lithuania and Azerbaijan. They also discussed Mikhail Gorbachev's coming visit to Spain, which is scheduled in principle for March, but which will depend on developments in the Soviet Union.

CPSU Delegation Completes Talks in Spain

PM1701111390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Off Home"]

[Text] Madrid, 15 Jan—A CPSU delegation headed by G.I. Revenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee [Obkom], left for home today. It had been visiting Spain at the invitation of the ruling Spanish Socialist Workers' Party [PSOE] leadership to discuss issues associated with the further development of CPSU-PSOE contacts.

During its stay in Spain the CPSU delegation met with the PSOE leadership and toured Catalonia, where it was familiarized with the activity of the Catalan Socialist Party (PSC-PSOE), had talks with the socialist parliamentary group, and was received by the chairman of the autonomous parliament of Catalonia and the mayor of Barcelona. Delegation head G.I. Revenko was received by Alfonso Guerra, Spanish deputy prime minister and deputy secretary general of the PSOE.

During the exchange of opinions the Spanish side showed great interest in the progress of perestroika in the USSR and expressed vigorous support for the profound transformations taking place in all spheres of Soviet society's life. The urgent need to steadily observe the Helsinki agreements and the immutability of postwar borders in Europe was particularly stressed.

It was noted that the PSOE advocates the holding of the "Helsinki 2" conference and the transformation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact into political alliances. It opposes the U.S. aggression in Panama. The CPSU delegation enquired about the PSOE's parliamentary activity and the socialists' work in the sphere of ecology, the social protection of working people, and trade unions, and about scientific and theoretical research being done on the problems for socialism in the future.

Both sides stressed their mutual interest in further developing ties and strengthening CPSU-PSOE cooperation. The PSOE was invited to send a party delegation to visit the USSR.

The CPSU delegation headed by G.I. Revenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, returned to Moscow from Madrid 15 January, after visiting Spain at the invitation of the PSOE leadership.

Further on Estonia's Vyalyas Visit to Finland

LD1601212190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1142 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Helsinki, 16 Jan (TASS)—TASS correspondent Arkadiy Prisyazhnyy reports:

V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, is here at the invitation from the "Paasikivi Society."

He has had a meeting with M. Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic. During the conversation, which was held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere, V.I. Vyalyas spoke about the processes of renewal which are taking place in Estonia. Particular attention was focused on questions of economic cooperation and the activities of joint enterprises.

The Estonian Communist Party leader addressed representatives of the country's political and business circles at the "Paasikivi Society." In his speech he noted that the implementation of the program of Estonia's economic independence, which was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet, is required to decide many serious problems in this sphere, and may become in the future an example for the whole country.

V.I. Vyalyas also stressed that in the matter of the building of a common European home the Baltic republics could assume the role of a kind of bridge between East and West.

In the sphere of foreign policy Estonia bases itself on three main principles: it must meet the interests of the Estonian people, the peoples of the Soviet Union, and also the interests of cooperation, security, and peace in Europe. V.I. Vyalyas noted that the time has come to expand economic, cultural and other contacts with foreign countries. Cooperation with the Nordic Council could become one possibility along this path. As a start, Estonia could establish contacts here in the sphere of culture, education, and the environment.

J. Iloniemi, president of the "Paasikivi Society," presented V.I. Vyalyas with the society's top award—the U.K. Kekkonen memorial Medal. V.I. Vyalyas presented a gift to the society in the form of a graphic picture of the work of (J. Soans), People's Artist of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Soviet-Finnish Cooperation Commissions Meet

LD1601231990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 16 Jan 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Surikov]

[Text] Helsinki, 16 Jan (TASS)—The state of and prospects for development of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Finland are being discussed at a meeting of the co-chairmen of the bilateral permanent intergovernmental commission for economic cooperation, which opened here today. The delegations at the talks are being headed by S.A. Sitaryan, chairman of the Soviet part of the commission, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, and H. Holkeri, chairman of the Finnish part of the commission, Finnish Prime Minister.

At the first session, which lasted about 3 hours, a positive appraisal was made of the results of 1989 cooperation. The sides examined measures on implementing the accords reached last October during M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to Finland. At the same time particular attention was concentrated on new directions and forms of Soviet-Finnish partnership.

This concerns, among other things, the training and education of cadres and management organization. Finnish businessmen, said L.M. Kondratyev, executive secretary of the commission, in a conversation with a TASS correspondent, have acquired good experience of trade organization. We are currently in great need of this. Over 12,500 Soviet enterprises, which have established the corresponding registration, are making direct foreign economic contacts. They are new to the market and they still have a lot to learn. Within the commission's framework, an accord was reached on setting up a working group to work out an agreement on cooperation in this sphere. A draft has already been prepared by Soviet specialists, and the finishing touches now have to be made to this document so that it may be signed during the next session of the commission.

Another very important question is that of cooperation in the conversion of Soviet defense industry enterprises. In this sphere it is possible to make use of Finnish technology and experience in production organization. The Finnish side was informed in detail today about specific trends of this work and about the type of product which interests the USSR's national economy, with a view to overcoming the trade deficit on the home market.

A thorough exchange of opinions was also held on joint efforts in environmental protection on the Kola peninsula. As is known, for some years now the harmful emissions from the "Pechenganikel" and "Severonikel" combines there have caused great anxiety. The great quantity of sulphurous compounds and salts of heavy metals in the atmosphere threaten the nature not only of our territory, but of Finnish territory, too. Practical steps to develop modern technologies in nature protection and on the construction of purification buildings in this region will be discussed in the near future with Finnish firms specializing in this sphere.

An accord was reached on holding the next session of the permanent intergovernmental commission in the 2d quarter of this year.

Recently the commission's executive secretary pointed out, considerable results have been achieved in bilateral relations. One may say that the past year ended with fine indices. We managed to avoid a significant fall in trade turnover which had threatened us. For the first time in the last few years the USSR has achieved a credit balance in its dealings with Finland, which has made it possible to pay off credits due to be cleared in advance and even to pay certain sums on the 1990 account. This provides us with the opportunity to further develop trade and to

think in terms of a certain broadening of goods purchases in Finland. In other words, the background of our cooperation is currently a favorable one. This was noted with satisfaction by both sides at today's meeting of the co-chairmen of the commission.

FRG's Kohl Remarks on Unification, USSR Ties

PM1201115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Second Edition pp 1, 7

[Own correspondent Ye. Grigoryev dispatch: "Overture in the 'Aquarium.' H. Kohl's News Conference"]

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jan—The news conference hall in Bonn nicknamed the "Aquarium" because of its high glass walls was full for the first meeting this year between FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl and representatives of the mass media.

The present head of the West German Government has probably not seemed so contented and self-assured for a long time. The economy is the strongest trump in his policies. Gross national product increased 4 percent last year. The best result in the eighties for the FRG. Everything indicates that the dynamics will be maintained in the upcoming period too. It was no accident that Chancellor H. Kohl began his statement in the "Aquarium" precisely with the economic "card."

The FRG's economic successes are luring many people from other countries, including the GDR, from where, according to Bonn data, more than 1,000 people are still arriving every day. And it is precisely the FRG's economic potential that enables Bonn to speak with Berlin from a position of strength today—at any rate, so certain circles here believe.

Does the FRG chancellor thereby acknowledge the militant right-wing circles in his country? Precisely these are now organizing a new campaign against political forces in the GDR in the shape of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism. They are conducting a bitter campaign, having seen for themselves that the prestige and the antifascist and peace-loving ideals of this party have in no way been canceled out. Under the slogan of equal opportunities for the opposition in the upcoming elections in the GDR the Bonn parties are trying to secure preferential chances for it via material and financial aid from the FRG. The discussion mainly revolved around these questions at H. Kohl's news conference.

It seems to me that in his introductory statement the FRG chancellor packed his plans for German unification more carefully into a West European and all-European framework than was the case when he advanced his "10 points" on this question at the end of November. West European integration was emphasized as "the nucleus of the future peaceful European order."

Touching on Soviet-West German relations, H. Kohl declared: "Our relations with the USSR retain their

central significance for us. At the same time we are conscious that the Soviet Union has now entered the decisive phase in implementing reforms. I personally will see to it that the joint statement signed by General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and myself 13 June and the other accords are fully implemented."

I put this question to him: "Precisely what does the chancellor have in mind?"

"The most important thing," he replied, "is the further development of economic cooperation. We have an interest in seeing the policy of perestroika pursued by M. Gorbachev succeed. But this success will depend substantially on whether the economic reform being implemented in the USSR justifies the hopes that people pin on it. This is a very important point. I will name another one in parallel. It is a question of taking really big steps in the disarmament sphere in 1990."

Someone inquired: Does the chancellor intend to visit Moscow this year? He replied that he considers such a meeting necessary and probable.

International affairs took up just a small part of the news conference. The chief purpose of the meeting with the press was, of course, different. Preparations are already under way in the FRG for the land and federal elections. The chancellor was in a hurry to place the accents on his policies, making the German question the leading question in the election struggle. Such was the overture in the "Aquarium."

View of GDR 'Dangerous Delusion'

PM1201152790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Grishin dispatch: "H. Kohl's News Conference"]

[Text] Bonn—FRG Chancellor H. Kohl's traditional New Year news conference was held in the press center in Bonn. During his conversation with journalists, he expounded the West German Government's basic trends in foreign and internal policy for the upcoming period.

This year, the chancellor said, promises to be particularly abundant in events that will be important for the future peaceful structure of Europe. Patience and responsibility are particularly important if we are not to lose our historic chance at this decisive moment. H. Kohl included "support for the political, economic, and social reforms in the Soviet Union and East European countries" among the most important of his cabinet's aims. The stable development and success of these reforms are in the interests of all Europeans.

Mutual relations with the Soviet Union have central significance for the FRG. I will personally make sure that the joint Soviet-GDR statement and the agreements signed during the visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the FRG in June 1989 are fully implemented, H. Kohl said. This

particularly concerns extending economic cooperation. I am very interested, he added, in deepening the good relations that were established during meetings with M.S. Gorbachev in October 1988 in Moscow and in June 1989 in Bonn. The chancellor's next visit to the Soviet Union will promote this.

The progressive development of the process started by the CSCE is particularly important for the future Europe-wide structure, H. Kohl continued. A conference on economic cooperation among the CSCE countries will be held between 19 March and 11 April of this year in the FRG. It is intended that the question of how to make Eastern partners' inclusion in all-European economic integration easier will be discussed there. I would like to mention my proposal to create a joint institute for the coordination of economic cooperation, as well as an all-European council for environmental protection. The head of the Bonn government supported the Soviet leadership's proposal to call an all-European meeting of the CSCE countries' heads of state in 1990. According to him, the first agreement on reducing conventional weapons in Europe could be signed at that meeting, and the general appearance of the future European structure could be discussed. I am also thinking of the French president's initiative on the formation of a great European confederation, H. Kohl noted.

The chancellor gave an optimistic assessment of future disarmament policy and arms control. The FRG Government is proceeding on the basis that the first agreement on conventional arms will be ready to be signed in summer of this year. I believe, he said, that in 1990 we will come closer to the aim of a general ban on chemical weapons. H. Kohl mentioned that this year American chemical weapons stocks will be completely withdrawn from the FRG. He expects obstacles in the way of an agreement on reducing strategic nuclear potential by half to be ironed out at the upcoming meeting between U.S. and USSR leaders. The Ottawa meeting between foreign ministers on the "open sky" question in February should, in his opinion, promote the mutual improvement of supervisory and confidence-building measures.

A large part of the Bonn leader's speech was devoted to inner-German problems. He spoke about the fact that the FRG and the GDR bear particular responsibility for peace and security in Europe. Relations between the two German states must develop in such a way that they will form part of the all-European processes. Germany's future structure must take shape within the framework of the all-European structure. My 10-point program shows by what means the German people can once again achieve unity, H. Kohl said. The chancellor confirmed that a second meeting with H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of ministers, would be held in February. The basic subject of the talks will be the elaboration of an agreement on cooperation and good-neighborliness between the two German states.

The chancellor warned against interference in the GDR's internal affairs. However, several times during the news

conference he himself violated this important principle in relations between the two sovereign republics. Thus, he demanded "that equal chances be given to all political parties" in the elections to the GDR People's Chamber on 6 May. Economic reform can only be successful, H. Kohl lectured, if the GDR leadership "quickly opens the country to Western investment and creates the conditions for private enterprise and a market economy." If Bonn's demands are not fulfilled, then, according to the Chancellor, a new situation will arise, which will force the FRG to reexamine the whole complex of relations with the GDR.

Similar advice, or else open pressure on the GDR, has been heard with increasing frequency recently on the banks of the Rhine. This is a dangerous delusion. GDR citizens do not need lectures from any side. They themselves will decide what path to take, including the path in relations with the FRG.

Genscher on 'Central Importance' of USSR Ties

PM1601144990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Prospects for Cooperation"]

[Text] Bonn, 15 Jan—The development of relations between the FRG and the USSR on the basis of the Moscow Treaty and the Soviet-West German joint statement signed during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG last June are of central importance for the expansion of East-West ties. This was stated by FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher in an interview with Deutschlandfunk [German radio].

H.-D. Genscher advocated the holding of a "Helsinki 2" conference in 1990. This forum, he stressed, provides a favorable opportunity for the signing of the first agreement on conventional forces in Europe. At the same time, it could elaborate a mandate for the holding of the second stage of the Vienna talks with a view to taking wide-ranging and decisive steps in the disarmament sphere.

Soviet-French Meeting Discusses Human Rights

PM1201144790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[PRAVDA-TASS report under the general heading: "News in Brief"]

[Text] Activists from the France-USSR Society, staffers from the French department of the human rights organization Amnesty International, representatives of the Soviet Embassy in France, and Soviet journalists have held a meeting. How is perestroika proceeding in the humanitarian sphere in the USSR? How do things stand with regard to the reform of Soviet legislation? Are people's deputies discussing the question of abolishing the death penalty or the possibility of alternative military service? These were the main subjects of an interesting discussion.

Right Wing Trying to 'Eliminate' French CP

PM1201162390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov dispatch: "Attack on the French Communist Party. What Is Behind the Campaign Against the French Communists"]

[Text] Paris, 11 Jan—People in France have perceived the events of the last few months in the countries of Eastern Europe in a disparate manner—some with hope, some with malicious glee at the "collapse of communism."

Although it is too early to talk of collapse, those for whom predictions of this kind have become a passion, "like an illness," are now trying to take revenge for all their unfounded forecasts. The anticommunists' revenge, as it were, is manifest in two dimensions—externally and internally.

Apart from outright incitement to eliminate socialism, they spend every day guessing: "Who is next?" A kind of blacklist is drawn up, figuring parties, heads of states and governments, and politicians.

The entire French Communist Party (PCF), which has been persecuted for years, has long been blacklisted in this way. A PCF Politburo statement published recently in L'HUMANITE points out that the anticommunists' carefully coordinated campaign against the PCF, in which virtually all the mass media are taking part, has reached an unprecedented scale of late. Its organizers, the statement points out, are not averse to using any means, including forgery.

These days right-wing newspapers, including LE FIGARO, are giving coverage both to former members of the PCF leadership and to those who, while remaining within the party, are acting to "renew" it. This is not being done to analyze the real state of affairs within the party but in order to spur on the immediate removal of G. Marchais from the post of PCF secretary general and the resignation of the entire incumbent PCF Politburo. The right-wing press has also urged such actions in the past. The publication of reports that G. Marchais spent a vacation in Romania several years ago and met with N. Ceausescu was the specific excuse for the latest upsurge in this campaign. But leaders of other French parties also met with him, and no one is demanding their resignation on these grounds.

A television program conducted a poll among PCF members with a view to finding out what they think of this. The assessment was virtually unanimous—this is the latest attack on the party rather than just its leadership. One Communist, incidentally, said that the organizers of the anti-PCF campaign do not care that a serious process of restructuring has been under way within the PCF of late. "The right-wingers' task," he added, "is to erase the PCF from the French political scene by any means."

Commenting on this campaign, R. Leroy, political director of L'HUMANITE, wrote in an editorial that the anticommunist revanchists are now trying not just to limit PCF influence but also effectively to eliminate it. They want to compel the PCF to renounce its policy in defense of working people's class interests and transform it into a social democratic-type party. Such attempts, R. Leroy concluded, must be resolutely rebuffed.

Greek Pressure on Albania Follows Romania Events

PM1601113190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Nikolayev report: "Anti-Albanian Demonstration in Athens"]

[Text] Athens—A mass demonstration was held in downtown Athens Thursday in defense of the rights of the "Greeks of Northern Epirus" (that is, Greeks living in southeast Albania).

In Greece, where Albanian official statistics have a poor reputation, the number of these Greeks is estimated as being up to 400,000 people.

The participants in the demonstration, in which the Greek Orthodox Church played an active role, adopted and handed to the Greek government a resolution containing, *inter alia*, a demand that the Albanian authorities respect human rights, open Orthodox churches, and allow the study of the Greek language in the country.

The vigor of the movement to defend the rights of "Northern Epirus Greeks" has increased noticeably in Greece since the December events in Romania. This question has become virtually the focus of Greece's foreign policy as well as its domestic policy when Foreign Minister A. Samaras made a statement concerning the position of the Greek minority in Albania and Albanian-Greek relations.

USSR's Abalkin Cited on Confidence in Leaders

LD1601115990 Hilversum International Service
in English 1130 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Speaking at a press conference at Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport, Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin said that the present leaders of the Soviet Union are in danger of losing the confidence of the Soviet people unless they can improve their standard of living this year. Mr Abalkin was in the Netherlands for talks with Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers and with prominent businessmen. He hopes to gain some insight into how a Western country like the Netherlands tackles inflation and combines socially conscious legislation with economic growth. Deputy Prime Minister Abalkin is chairman of the Soviet State Commission for Economic Reform.

Latin America & Caribbean

Khachaturov Comments on U.S. Panama 'Aggression'

PY1601202490 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Spanish 0100 GMT 15 Jan 90

[Report on "interview" with Karen Khachaturov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Latin America; date and place not given—read by announcer]

[Text] A meeting to condemn the Yankee intervention in Panama took place in Moscow today. This action, improper for a civilized country, has trampled over the people's rights. We interviewed Soviet publisher [publicist] Karen Khachaturov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Latin America and one of the organizers of this meeting.

Our reporter asked him if this was the only meeting that had been held on this subject. Khachaturov noted that on 20 December, a few hours after the U.S. military aggression had begun, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Latin America issued an ad hoc declaration condemning this aggressive action, which is a violation of international law and the UN Charter. We stressed yesterday that, regardless of the reasons for the invasion, the military action itself constituted a crime and we demanded an immediate evacuation of U.S. troops, he said. We called on the world to protest this intervention, he continued, and this appeal will certainly continue as our order of the day. The U.S. invasion is particularly condemnable in these times, when the rest of the world is overcoming its conflicts through dialogue, Khachaturov stated. He continued: This tendency is in contrast to the regrettable U.S. practice of assuming missions to safeguard others with an intention to punish, pardon, judge, and repress. Such a stance cannot but worry the thoughtful politicians of both East and West, since they understand that gunboat policy cannot be reimplemented. President Bush recently stated that all the objectives of the Panama invasion have been met and that the U.S. troops could now return home; that is, the work is done and the matter is closed.

Is this the case? Khachaturov replied: I am sure that considering the matter finished is [word indistinct]. This is why: It is not just Noriega. The issue is that nobody has given the United States the right to install the chief of an administration. How can we forget that nearly 1,000 Panamanians died? How can we forget that thousands of Panamanians lost their loved ones? How can we forget that many lost their homes and jobs? How can we forget the concentration camp that the Yankees built in Panama? Its organizers have proudly stated that their concentration camp is larger than the ones built during the U.S. aggression against Vietnam. No, the U.S. withdrawal from Panama is not a simple matter. This aggression will affect not only the Panamanian people but also U.S. citizens for a long time to come.

How do we know this? One of the reasons for the intervention, in the gringos' words, was to protect U.S. citizens. What do you think about this? Khachaturov answers: There is something else involved. Obviously, deep down the reason is the U.S. unwillingness to give up the canal in just 10 more years, on 31 December 1999, when the interocean route must be turned over to Panamanian sovereignty. It is no secret that the U.S. search for another site for its major bases in Latin America has been unsuccessful. Furthermore, the transfer of all that military infrastructure from Panama would cost at least \$50 billion. Herein are the hidden reasons.

As for protecting U.S. citizens, the U.S. invasion of Panama was actually a risk to their lives. Who can guarantee that people from other Latin American countries will not be the target of U.S. attacks? According to the latest news, declarations in that regard have already been made in Chile and Colombia. As we can see, there can be no general security in like this. Frankly, the United States should have learned this a long time ago.

Dear listeners, this has been an interview with Karen Khachaturov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Latin America.

Relations Established With Antigua, Barbuda

*LD1601174290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An official ceremony of exchange of documents enshrining the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the state of Antigua and Barbuda took place in New York. It is an island state in the Caribbean with the population of approximately 100,000 people. The capital is the town of Saint Johns. On behalf of their countries, the documents were exchanged by Ambassador Belonogov, permanent USSR representative at the United Nations, and by Lyonel Hyorst, Antigua and Barbuda's permanent representative at the United Nations. Lyonel Hyorst, who, by coincidence, will represent his country in Moscow, gave a brief interview for the Soviet television.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Now that diplomatic relations have been established with the Soviet Union, in what direction do you intend to develop future contacts?

[Hyorst in English with superimposed Russian translation] Well, we know a lot about your country's rich culture and historical traditions. We hope that we will be able to tangibly step up cultural contacts between our countries. Apart from this, tourism, upon which Antigua and Barbuda's economy depends to a considerable extent, may become an important aspect of our exchanges. We are also ready to make our harbors available for Soviet vessels. In recent years many of them have already dropped anchor in our shores. So, through the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, we hope to reach a serious level in our trade and tourist exchanges. [end recording]

Broadcasting Agreement Signed With Ecuador

*LD1601132990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1832 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] Quito, 15 Jan (TASS)—A cooperation agreement to implement joint television and radio programs was signed here today between the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the National Secretariat of Ecuador for Communications with the Public.

The agreement provides for the reciprocal dissemination of material about various aspects of the life of the Soviet and Ecuadorian peoples through the mass information media of the two countries.

The agreement was signed on behalf of the Government of Ecuador by Luis Eladio Proano, [name as received] national secretary for communications with the public (minister of information), and on the Soviet side by V.G. Chekmazov, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in the Republic of Ecuador.

Speaking at the signing ceremony, Luis Eladio Proano noted that it will better serve understanding between the peoples of Ecuador and the Soviet Union and the development of ties between the two countries in the field of culture, sports, and education.

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Meets 16 Jan

Discusses Baltic Laws

LD1601214990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Second Edition p 1

[Text] There was a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 16 January in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The session discussed questions concerning the holding of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It has decided to convene the session on 14 February 1990. The press is publishing the decree on the USSR Supreme Soviet's convocation. The proposals on matters to be submitted for the USSR Supreme Soviet's consideration have been approved.

A wide range of issues concerning key aspects of Soviet society are to be examined at the session. The Second USSR People's Deputies Congress charged the Supreme Soviet with accelerating the passing of a number of laws aimed at implementing economic reform, further improving the Soviet federation, and strengthening law and order. Therefore at the session, first and foremost, it is proposed that the laws should be discussed and passed that are called upon to transform the entire economic basis—on ownership in the USSR, on land, on the tax system, and on the general principles of local self-government and local management in the USSR.

The country's supreme power body also envisions a package of draft laws related to the differentiation of powers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the union republics, the strengthening of their sovereignty, and the free development of the nations and ethnic minorities within the framework of the Soviet federal state. It is planned to submit to the Supreme Soviet draft laws on providing citizens with pensions, on vacations, on the press and other mass media which have been published for nationwide discussion. Great attention is being paid to draft laws aimed at extending the processes of democratization; strengthening the guarantees, rights, and interests of citizens; and intensifying the struggle against violators of the law.

From the report given by A. I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet to implement the decisions of the Second USSR People's Deputies Congress. The Presidium has approved these proposals and has submitted them for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On the government's submission, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has examined the question of the lack of correspondence of some legislative acts of the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic with the USSR constitution and laws. In the report made by A.P. Biryukova, deputy chairperson of the USSR Council of

Ministers, it was noted that in the USSR law passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet in November last year "On the economic Independence of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic," a combination of republican economic independence with the established functions of the USSR, the implementation by the supreme bodies of power and the administration by the republics of their own functions within the framework of the USSR laws, are envisaged as one of the fundamental principles. However, back in December 1989 the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics' Supreme Soviet adopted laws and decisions which go against union legislation requirements.

With its legislative acts the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic supreme soviet has suspended the fulfilment on the republic's territory of Article 15 of the USSR law "On the USSR State Budget for 1990", and in spite of union legislation, it has essentially abolished the division of taxes and incomes into all-union and republican, after specifying them all without exception to be republican ones.

The operation of several provisions of USSR Supreme Soviet decisions on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, concerning the taxation of the fund for the payment of (associations) state enterprises' labor, measures regulating the growth of resources for the payment of labor by cooperatives in the spheres of production and services, by lease-holders' organizations and by enterprises of other social organizations, was suspended by a Lithuanian Supreme Soviet 7 December 1989 decision.

The operation of a number of provisions of USSR Government decisions of 26 March 1988 and 30 September 1988 was suspended by the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic law "On the Republican Budget of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic for 1990."

When examining additional sources of financing for several social measures, the USSR Supreme Soviet voted down [otklonil] the proposal to raise prices of a number of goods in daily demand, including spirits and tobacco products. However, the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, on the proposal of the republican government, in its law "On the State Budget of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic for 1990" provided for increases on the retail prices of these goods, although this action falls within the purview of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (Article 73 of the USSR Constitution). Such a decision breaches the unity of pricing policy on the territory of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic, destabilizing the consumer market and exerting a negative influence on the people's mood.

On 4 December 1989 the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet adopted a law on paying working pensioners their old age pensions in full at the expense of the state's social security resources, although the 1990 state social security budget's expenditure

already exceeds revenue to the tune of R24.7 billion, this being made good through subsidies from the Union budget. It is obvious that the adoption of this decision will lead to an additional use of the resources of the Union budget for the needs of the Republic, and for this reason cannot fall within the remit of this Union republic. These republican acts are contrary to the legislative acts of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic and undermine the implementation of measures, supported by the Second USSR People's Deputies Congress, aimed at improving the money in circulation and strengthening the consumer market.

In its decision, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium noted that the norms of the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics' legislative acts, referred to above, cannot, by virtue of Articles 74 and 173 of the USSR Constitution, be in force on the territory of those republics, since they contradict the norms of the Union Constitution and USSR laws. On the basis of Point No 5, Article 119 of the USSR Constitution, the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics' Supreme Soviet Presidiums have been instructed to adopt, according to established procedure, measures to bring the republics' legislative acts into line with the USSR Constitution and laws.

By USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree, M.L. Rostropovich and G.P. Vishnevskaya have had their USSR citizenship restored. At the same time, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree depriving them of their state awards and honorary titles of People's Artists of the USSR is recognized as having lost its force.

Certain other issues concerning the country's state life were also examined at the session.

Gorbachev Chairs Session

LD1601185890 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today chaired a session in the Kremlin of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Presidium discussed matters relating to the forthcoming third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It was decided to convene the session on February 14 1990.

The session is expected to consider an extensive range of questions. The Second Congress of People's Deputies instructed the Supreme Soviet to expedite the adoption of a number of laws aimed at the implementation of economic reform, the perfection of the Soviet federation and the strengthening of law and order. The first items on the agenda will cover the discussion and promulgation of the laws on ownership, land, taxation, the fundamentals of local self-government and local economies—laws required to transform the entire economic basis.

The country's supreme body of state authority will also consider a package of laws covering the delimitation of

jurisdiction between the union and constituent republics, the consolidation of their sovereignty and the free development of nations and nationalities within the framework of the Soviet federal state.

The Presidium also discussed the organisation of the Supreme Soviet work to implement the decisions of the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

The Presidium examined the question, submitted by the government, concerning the non-compliance of certain regulatory enactments promulgated in Estonia and Lithuania with the USSR Constitution and legislation. The Supreme Soviets of these two republics adopted in December 1989 laws and decrees which are at variance with the provisions of federal legislation.

The acts in question include the Estonian Supreme Soviet decree on the suspension on republican territory of the implementation of an article of the USSR law "On the State Budget of the Soviet Union for 1990." The decree defies national legislation by disregarding the division of taxation and incomes into federal and republican and defining all of them without exception as republican.

The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in turn, suspended, on the republican territory, the effect of certain provisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees concerning, among other things, taxation of the wage funds at enterprises (associations).

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet decreed that as a number of norms set forth in the regulatory enactments of Estonia and Lithuania are not consistent with the norms of the union constitution and Soviet laws, the presidiums of the Estonian and Lithuanian Supreme Soviets are instructed to make the regulatory enactments of these republics consistent with the USSR Constitution and the laws of the USSR.

The Presidium approved a decree to reinstate Mstislav Rostropovich and Galina Vishnevskaya as Soviet citizens. At the same time it proclaimed null and void the decree stripping them of state awards and honorary degrees of USSR people's artists.

The Presidium considered some other matters of state life.

Supreme Soviet Committees Resume Work

LD1101173190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0900 GMT 11 Jan 90

[Text] Work in the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet continues. Deputies are examining not only those draft bills which have already had a hearing at Supreme Soviet sessions, but also draft bills which will be adopted in the future. Among them are draft bills on quality of output and protection of consumers' rights, on inventing in the USSR, and a number of other documents.

The Committee for Economic Reform is working on draft laws on quality, on land, and on the socialist enterprise.

The Commission for Planning, Budget and Finance of the Soviet of the Union is preparing a final version of the draft bill on taxation.

The question of measures for implementing the Housing 2000 programs has been examined in the Committee for Construction and Architecture.

Ecology, Architecture Open Round

PM1201093390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondent report: "27 Kalinin Avenue, Moscow. USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions Resume Work"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources and the Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions were the first to open the next round of parliamentary activity after a short vacation.

Ecologists heard and assessed the report of N.N. Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Protection of the Environment, which were preliminary notes of a long-term state program for a major, wholesale improvement of the country's environment, which will be closely connected with the ratification of emergency ecological measures by the second session of the Supreme Soviet. The deputies noted once again that the territories that suffered as a result of the accident at Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station, and the Aral, Volga, and Caspian territories are those that need the most urgent and serious action.

"Therefore we will try to work efficiently in collaboration with the government on this state program," committee chairman K. Salykov says. We want to submit it at the upcoming Supreme Soviet Session, so that all the basic measures will be included in the 13th 5-year plan. A draft law on the environment is also being drawn up. Deputies are meeting with scientists and experts, and are introducing a large number of proposals that take into consideration the interests of the country as a whole as well as of specific regions.

There are many arguments going on over the "Housing-2000" program, which affects the interests of tens of millions of people. Will it be fulfilled or not? Does every family have the possibility of obtaining a separate apartment? These questions worry many people. This problem was approached from a rather different angle at the Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions: Comfortable accommodation with modern conveniences that meets all contemporary requirements is in

demand now and always will be. And solving the problem by campaign methods is inadmissible.

Industrial and management structures, state investment policy, and—the main thing—the legislative enactments that determine mutual relations between the owners of the accommodation and the tenants on the one hand and the state organizations and organs of soviet power in the localities on the other must be changed. For this reason the committee started the sessions by hearing a report by V.M. Serov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction, on improving the country's investment activity and the economic mechanism. Deputies also discussed with interest a speech by A.P. Ivanov, chief of the Ministry of Construction in the Northern and Western Regions of the USSR Main Economic Administration—this was one of the organizations which the committee involved in the preparation of investment legislation.

The next day was also a busy one for this committee, as it examined a proposal by Professor K.K. Kartashovaya of the Moscow Architectural Institute and a group of scientists and a number of deputies on the creation of an all-union public "Housing" center within the committee to deal with all questions of the country's housing policy. It is intended that the center will supply the parliamentarians with all the information and analytical materials necessary for legislative activity, and create a data base.

There is another novelty in this plan. The center intends to give concrete assistance to individual cities and even regions in developing their urban planning, bearing in mind the specific conditions, possibilities, and traditions of the territories concerned. After a long and detailed discussion, with the participation of B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the committee, I.A. Andreyeva, G.V. Baravikas, A.A. Korshunov, A.F. Nasonov, D.G. Gilalzade, M.A. Bocharov, and others, it was decided that the public "Housing" center would be created.

A report was also heard from representatives of the USSR State Planning Committee on measures to fulfill the "Housing-2000" program. And another of the committee's decisions will obviously provoke the readers' interest: Reports on the work of all ministers who received a recommendation from the committee when the USSR Supreme Soviet ratified their appointments will be heard in the near future.

The Committee for the Affairs of Veterans and Invalids, the Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions, and a number of other bodies in our parliament started discussing the draft law on pensions.

From next week, all Supreme Soviet committees and commissions will resume their regular work in their new premises.

Land Law Discussion*LD1001194190 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT
10 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 10 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Most Soviet citizens who voiced their opinion in the discussion of the bill on land generally supported the bill. This was stated at the first session of the Soviet parliamentary commission that considered proposals and critical remarks made in the discussion.

The first reading of the draft fundamentals of legislation on land of the USSR and union republics was approved by Soviet parliament at the end of last November. By the beginning of the third Supreme Soviet session in February, the commission is expected to complete a summary of the discussion.

The bill aims to abolish the state monopoly on the ownership and management of land and create various forms of land ownership. It lays down that land is the inalienable property of the people residing on a given territory and empowers local soviets of people's deputies to dispose of the land.

The bill envisages, among other things, allotting land to farming families for life with the right to pass it down as inheritance, and to collective and state farms as collective property without the right to buy and sell land.

The present discussion differs favourably from previous ones also because all incoming letters are computer processed and wide use is made of public opinion polls.

Many letters say the right to manage land is not enough and call for legalising private ownership. Other letters call for a return to exclusive state ownership, that is not mentioned in the bill. Others demand that the law clearly define the mechanism for transferring land to individuals and collectives, and that all land be reevaluated.

Commission member Academician Vladimir Tikhonov proposed granting collective farm members the right to own land so as to enable them to leave the collective while retaining their lot. In this way the question of whether to preserve collective farms or not would be decided by farmers themselves.

Supreme Soviet 3d Session Decreed To Open 14 Feb*LD1601161490 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—The third session of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will open in Moscow on February 14, 1990. This is announced in the ukase (decree) of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, published today. The document is signed by Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev.

Political & Social**Gorbachev Chairs CPSU CC Russian Bureau 15 Jan***LD1501202590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1851 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jan (TASS)—There has been a session of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee [CC], which was formed by the December (1989) CPSU Central Committee plenum, and was chaired by M.S. Gorbachev. In accordance with its tasks—to coordinate the activity of the oblast and kray party organizations of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], aimed at fulfilling the policy of the CPSU, and at implementing control over the fulfilment of the decisions of the party congresses and conferences, of plena and CPSU Central Committee politburos, the Russian bureau examined some urgent questions of the activity of republic's party organizations. A number of first secretaries kraykoms and obkoms of the CPSU took part in the sitting.

In connection with the upcoming elections to the republican and local bodies of power, the Russian bureau of the CPSU Central Committee discussed and approved the text of an address to the peoples of Soviet Russia. It emphasizes the important role of the RSFSR in strengthening the friendship of peoples, the single Soviet family, and contains a call to decisively implement perestroika in order that it bears tangible fruits in the nearest future. The text of the address will be published in the press.

The Central Committee bureau examined the concept of Russia's economic sovereignty. During an exchange of opinions, it was noted that a strong Russian economy is of very great significance for strengthening the country's federative structure in its new political and economic content. Approaches guaranteeing a qualitatively new level of managing economic relations and the social restructuring of the regions should be the foundation of the republic's economic development.

Emphasis was laid upon the need to speed up work on the concept, namely ensuring wide involvement in it of scientific organizations, leaders of the autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, and carrying out a thorough study of the basic provisions with the union organs, in close conjunction with the measures for the country's socioeconomic development.

The progress of preparations in the RSFSR for the elections of people's deputies to republican and local soviets was discussed at the bureau sitting. It was pointed out that the campaign on elections of people's deputies is in the majority of places marked by a high level of activity on the part of voters, and by a keen preelection struggle, and is creating conditions for conducting voting on an alternative basis.

On average, eight contenders have been nominated as candidate people's deputies for one seat in the RSFSR, and up to three contenders in the autonomous republics.

One million two hundred thousand people have been nominated candidate deputies to local soviets, or 1.5 times as many as there are seats.

The Central Committee bureau instructed kray committees and oblast committees of the party to make an attentive analysis of the results of the nomination process, and to define the correct tactics for conducting the further stages of the preelection struggle. The task consists of ensuring victory to those of the candidates nominated who will be able to work actively and constructively in the soviets. Special attention should be given to supporting candidates from among workers, peasants, women, and young people.

Party committees were recommended to put constant emphasis during their political work on explaining the importance of the elections for implementing political reform and for ensuring the sovereignty of the soviets, and on the responsible tasks which the working people of the republic have to achieve in 1990.

A number of other issues relating to the activity of party organizations of the Russian Federation were examined at the session.

Situation 'Extremely Tense' in Azerbaijan, Armenia

PM1601165690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs by IZVESTIYA correspondents A. Pokrovskiy and S. Mostovschikov under the general heading: "Situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia"]

[Text] Yerevan—The situation in the republic is extremely tense. In the last 24 hours 16 armed attacks on protected sites were recorded. There is only one aim—to overpower by force of arms. Such instances were noted in Artashatskiy Rayon, where at 0200 hours on 15 January about 3,000 people burst into the city militia department building and seized 106 training submachineguns, 30 carbines, 27 TOZ rifles, 11 revolvers, 3,232 cartridges, and 1 training grenade-thrower.

In Yerevan at about 1600 hours a group of people attacked the Shaumyanskiy Rayon militia department and, threatening them with weapons, stole 83 training submachineguns, 383 hunting rifles, 111 TOZ rifles, 6,219 cartridges, 4 revolvers, 3 "Viola" radio stations, 3 megaphones, and rubber nightsticks....

Yerevan's Leninskiy, Sovetskiy, Myasnikyanskiy, Spandaryanskiy, and 26 Commissars Rayon and Abovyan City Internal Affairs Departments were attacked at 1930 hours. The quantity of weapons stolen here is being clarified. But it is already clear that the quantity is considerable. There were also attacks on the military training faculty at the polytechnical institute, the premises of a company of servicemen, the guardroom at the "Polivinilatsetal" Production Association, the Gumuzh

Hydroelectric Power Station, the "Soyuzmelio-vzryvprom" storehouse, and the security forces at the Masis railroad station. Here too extremists tried to seize weapons and alas, they succeeded.

The casualties. In Araratskiy Rayon three citizens of Armenian nationality were admitted to the rayon hospital at 0830 hours with bullet wounds, and two of them fled after receiving medical assistance. The third died without regaining consciousness. It has been established that they received their wounds as a result of clashes near the village of Kerki in Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. A skirmish took place there....

Stepanakert—Since the outbreak of conflict, 20 people have died here, and more than 260 have sustained injuries.... There have been arson attacks and orgies of destruction. There are unceasing shellings of settlements and security forces posts and details, and hostages are seized. Railroad and motor transport are shelled and stoned.... In recent days alone in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, Lieutenant I. Tsymbalyuk and Private M. Mantayev have died, and five servicemen in the internal troops have been injured.

The blockade of the highways continues. In the last 3 days no freight trains have reached Stepanakert station.

Since the start of the conflict internal affairs organs and internal troops have prevented several dozen acts of sabotage and group hooligan actions and arrested some 26,000 citizens for various infringements of the law. Nearly 3,000 items of firearms and other weapons have been confiscated. More than 180 criminal cases are under investigation in connection with mass disturbances and crimes arising from interethnic disputes. Proceedings are being taken against more than 50 people. "The situation today," Major General Yu. Kosolapov, commandant of the special district, believes, "is such that the imposition of a state of emergency is the only way out of the crisis."

Nakhichevan—A state of emergency has also been imposed on the Azerbaijani sector of the Soviet-Iranian border. As we were told by the Nakhichevan border detachment, in the afternoon of 16 January the situation on the border and in the border zone remained calm on the whole. Several crossings of the Araks River by the local population were recorded, but they were not on a mass scale.

In Nakhichevan ASSR's Ilichevskiy Rayon, some 3,000 people completely blockaded the village of Kerki at 0750 hours. Five houses belonging to Azerbaijanis were set on fire. The local population left the village.... The situation is fortunately being controlled by subunits of the internal troops who arrived on the scene.

Baku—On 15 January 11 bodies (10 men, 1 woman) showing signs of violent death were found in various parts of Baku. Four of the bodies (three men and one woman) have been identified.

War from the air again—in Shaumyanskiy Rayon [as published; reference is presumably to Shaumyanovskiy Rayon in Azerbaijan, rather than Shaumyanskiy Rayon in Yerevan] at about 1400 hours the village of Todan came under fire from a helicopter (with no identification marks). Two people were hit. In Zangelanskiy Rayon the village of Seidlyar came under fire from the direction of Armenia's Kafanskiy Rayon on the night of 14-15 January. At 1300 hours the village of Gadzhilar in Lachinskiy Rayon came under fire from the direction of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic's Gorisskiy Rayon. Abdulazimov, a local inhabitant, was killed....

In Khanlarskiy Rayon there were armed clashes between groups of Azerbaijanis and Armenians. As a result of an attack on the Armenian villages of Azad, Kamo, and Chaykend, there were casualties. According to preliminary figures there were seven Azerbaijani casualties, two of whom were killed. This happened after the crowd had been fired on from helicopters, which are flying without identification marks. In Khanlar itself, a grenade was thrown from a passing "Ural" car. The result—four people were injured.

Now the latest figures. From 11 through 16 January 1990, a total of 56 people were killed, of whom 9 have been identified as being of Azerbaijani nationality and 28 of Armenian nationality. The nationality of the other people killed has not yet been established. Two representatives of public order protection have died, and 156 people have been seriously injured....

Baku Death Toll Exceeds 40

*LD1701063990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0430 GMT 17 Jan 90*

[Text] [Reporter Aleksandr Ruvinskiy] We will begin this bulletin with a report from Baku. Our special correspondent, Leonid Lazarevich, is now on the line to our studio, speaking by telephone. If you please, Leonid, we are listening to you. How is the situation at present?

[Lazarevich] You know, I so much hope that I soon will have an opportunity to report that the most terrible things in Baku are over. Unfortunately, however, that moment has not yet come. I found out late in the evening that there have been new casualties. The number of those who have perished during the events in Baku already has exceeded 40. In the meantime, criminal proceedings have been initiated on this tragic occasion. The numbers of those detained are increasing. The internal affairs organs have been given an order to put an end to the pogroms in the most resolute manner. The militia have obtained considerable reinforcements of internal affairs troops. There are many patrols on the streets at present. During the evening hours, there were ever new telephone calls to be heard at the duty section of the Baku militia administration, and operational groups have gone to the addresses mentioned to the militia.

You know, death is always a tragedy; violent death is a 3-fold tragedy. Well, what is happening here may have

consequences in the far distant future. I am thinking about how a little boy will grow up, what will become of him, when he has seen his father and mother beaten up or killed before his very eyes.

For all that, I do not want you to think that Baku is like a frontline city. You know, normal life goes on, too. People go about their affairs. They simply do not know that terrible things are happening in their yard or entrance porch, 50 meters away, but those who know attempt to prevent it. I will not tire of repeating that I know of hundreds of cases, and there are evidently thousands of them really, in which neighbors have given refuge to Armenians and have attempted to come to their assistance. I will stress once again: The overwhelming majority of Baku residents condemn the violence, but to be fair, many people also condemn us, those who are recounting it, as well. They would like us to speak more about how the atmosphere in the city is being heated up by the raids in areas by Armenian fighters [boyeviki], the firing upon Azerbaijani villages from helicopters, the exchanges of fire, hostage-taking, the concentration of large groups of people on the borders of Azerbaijan. All these things are taking place and they really must be covered, too.

Well, I simply cannot yet leave Baku for other areas while things here are as they are, although I would very much like to travel to Khanlarskiy Rayon, for example, where the situation is very, very tense. Yes, there is bloodshed not just in Baku, but in many other areas, too, and in Nagorno-Karabakh, of course, where events have heated up the situation so much. As you know, as we have reported, a state of emergency has been introduced in Nagorno-Karabakh and neighboring areas, in border areas. Military commands have been set up. The state of emergency provides for the confiscation of weapons, a ban on meetings and strikes, and detention of up to 30 days. All of this is by decision of the military commander. We all are counting very much on this measure—the state of emergency—providing an opportunity for the situation to stabilize.

[Ruvinskiy] Thank you. The official TASS report that we have includes the phrase: Residents are demanding that the authorities adopt further resolute measures. What do you think? Are these measures being taken, after all, and they are sufficiently resolute?

[Lazarevich] There was a meeting yesterday at the party Central Committee, and Comrade Primakov, candidate member of the Politburo, told us of the program of measures that is being adopted. The arguments he put forward were convincing ones, I think, but it is obviously very, very difficult to master the situation.

[Ruvinskiy] Thank you for what you have told us. The point is that our special correspondents, who are keeping us informed, are one of the few sources of full information about these events which we are getting at the editorial desk.

Foreign Ministry Says 40-50 Killed

AU1601133490 Paris AFP in English 1316 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan 16 (AFP)—Between 40 and 50 people have been killed in the latest fighting between Azeris and Armenians in the Caucasus region, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said here Tuesday.

He described the fighting between the two communities over the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh as "clashes only", rejecting the term "civil war" which he said applied only when "one part of the country is the fighting the other part".

In this case, the "centre is trying to hold apart" the two communities who are "almost at war", Mr Gerasimov acknowledged.

Official Toll Set at 56

LD1701094690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0848 GMT 17 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jan—TASS special correspondents report:

According to reports from Krasnovodsk, a port town in Soviet Turkmenia situated on the eastern coast of the Caspian Sea, vessels carrying Armenian refugees from Baku are continuing to arrive there. Many of them are women, old people, and children. They are being given essential help with accommodations, and free food and medical care have been organized. Ambulances are stationed at the port and a telegraph center has been set up. All refugees are being given an opportunity to continue their journey to various cities in the country. Having arranged the relevant documents, many of them have left by air or rail for different cities in the country. Over 4,000 people have already departed.

"We try to give help to each person who arrives here", Lyudmila Gushchina, head of the refugee aid headquarters organized in Krasnovodsk, told a TASS correspondent. "Work collectives and the population have organized a collection of warm clothes and money for the migrants. The city's party and local soviet workers are supervising the situation at the ferry terminal and maintaining law and order."

According to USSR Interior Ministry information, by 16 January the number of dead as a result of the pogroms in Baku is 56, mainly people of Armenian nationality, and 156 people have been injured.

The situation remains extremely tense in areas adjacent to Nagorno-Karabakh, where considerable guerilla forces from Azerbaijan and Armenia are concentrated.

During yesterday, more than 6,000 additional internal troops were sent into the areas of the Transcaucasus where the state of emergency has been declared. Military units of the Soviet Army totalling more than 5,000 men

have been sent to assist the Internal Ministry [MVD] troops. Investigation and operational groups of the MVD and the USSR Procuracy have been formed and dispatched. Commander's offices and command sectors are being created. Forty nine provocateurs and participants in pogroms have been detained. The decisive and professional actions by law and order squads have made it possible to save the lives of many people. Vital sites—transport, enterprises, and airports—are being put under guard. Steps are being taken to confiscate stolen weapons and to establish the identity of persons who have committed illegal acts.

Guarding of the USSR state border has been intensified.

Among the emergency measures are a ban on holding meetings, rallies, and street marches, control of the mass media, and halting activities by organizations and voluntary associations of citizens or disbanding them. Strikes are also banned; the entry and exit of and traffic movements are restricted; the checking of documents is being introduced; and firearms and other weapons are being temporarily confiscated from citizens, and where necessary from enterprises, establishments, and organizations. Persons who provoke violations of public order can be detained for up to 30 days. Other emergency measures are also provided for.

Yerevan Reaction to Clashes Described

LD1601185390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1600 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From the news bulletin presented by commentator Andrey Ptashnikov]

[Text] [Ptashnikov] Now, esteemed comrades, about the latest events in Armenia and Azerbaijan. To start with, we link up with Yerevan. On the line is our correspondent, Koryun Khumaryan:

[Khumaryan] At Yerevan kiosks today you won't find the TRUD newspaper which published the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the introduction of a state of emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and adjoining regions of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and also in regions of Azerbaijan on the border with Iran and the Gorriskey rayon of the Armenian SSR. The attitude toward this document in the city is extremely contradictory. Some people—there aren't all that many of them—see in the decree the latest anti-Armenian act by the center, while other people—it seems to me that they are in the majority—do not believe in the effectiveness of the measures being taken, referring to the fact that although the corresponding points in the decree went into force as far back as 2300, 15 January, to date the blockade of railroads and highways from Azerbaijan to Armenia and the NKAO has still not been lifted. Since 11 January not one freight car has traveled the Azerbaijan railroad to Armenia. Many industrial enterprises and power installations have not succeeded in accumulating any kind of serious reserves of raw materials and fuel during the

short-lived work of the railroad, and are now already working a half their capacity, while in the next few days, if the situation does not change for the better, they will come to a complete halt. Many of the people that I happened to talk to today are surprised at the mildness of the formulations regarding Baku, guilty of new pogroms and carnage.

Here are several interviews given on the streets of Yerevan today:

[Begin recording] [First unidentified woman] In the final analysis you have standing next to each other civilization and the Middle Ages. We mustn't surrender to the Middle Ages and to those repressions that are taking place in Azerbaijan with regard to the Armenian people.

[Unidentified man] Following the call by the Central Committee for refugees to return to their homes, their native hearths, where they were living... but once they returned, now they are killing them for this [sentence as heard]. Who should answer for this? That is what interests the Armenian people at this time.

[Second unidentified woman] Even at such a time Moscow must not react so calmly.

[Ptashnikov] Well, I think that in order to settle the situation it is essential first and foremost to have the readiness of both republics for talks, mutual understanding, and, if you like, sensible compromise.

Incidentally the dispatch said that in Yerevan very few people today managed to read the decree on the declaration of a state of emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and certain other regions. So, esteemed comrades, the text of the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium will be broadcast on the First Program of All-Union Radio immediately after our news bulletin. I repeat, that's on the First Programme, while on Mayak it will be broadcast at 2030.

Emergency Decree's Effects in NKAO

LD1601144890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0930 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From "Vremya" newscast; A. Barkhatov report from Nagorno-Karabakh, over video]

[Text] Here is a report from Nagorno-Karabakh, perhaps the country's main hot spot. Our special correspondent sent it in from Stepanakert yesterday. The situation there remains as you will see in the reportage. The decree on introducing a state of emergency came into force there yesterday [15 January]. We will try to keep you up to date about all the changes in the situation as new reports come in. Over to Stepanakert.

[Barkhatov] Several days have passed since representatives of both the commission for monitoring the implementation of the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the organizational committee that has been set up started work in rayons of Nagorno-Karabakh. Besides, the

special administration committee has not resigned, either. But despite all this, the situation is still deteriorating. While I am sending this report, information on armed preparations by both sides are continuing to come to the military commandant's office of the special district. Moreover, tension is rising in rayons of Azerbaijan and Armenia adjacent to Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. To make the Army's work more difficult, roads are frequently blocked by vehicles. [video shows soldiers in the town's streets, people in line at a bakery, a blown-up bridge, an aerial shot of a road packed with vehicles of various types]

The members of the commission and the organizational committee, who have arrived to monitor and observe the situation, refuse to meet journalists. And one can understand why. So far, their work is one of the last chances to find the right ways to solve the problem. One must say, however, that the passing of time resembles the smouldering of a Bickford fuse. [video shows people gathering in the streets]

The first conversations were conducted in the Azerbaijani town of Shusha.

[Unidentified man] Yes, it has become very uneasy here of late.

[Barkhatov] How do you see, say, the arrival of that commission, the organizational commission which is expected to solve many problems?

[Man] Yes, the commission arrived today. This morning they wanted to go to Stepanakert, the NKAO's capital, but they could not get there.

[Barkhatov] And you, for example, do you believe that all this can be solved by peaceful means.

[Second unidentified man] Never!

[Third man] People do not believe anybody any longer.

[Barkhatov] And what do you think, on the whole, is there any way to avoid blood, bloodshed?

[Man—off-screen] No. [video shows Barkhatov talking to the group of men]

[Barkhatov] This is Stepanakert on the same day.

[Parkev, bishop of Artsakh] Some people speak about some kind of religious confrontation. I would not maintain this because, at least today, there is no religious confrontation here and, God forbid that it should ever happen. For religious confrontations and religious feuds are the most senseless things that can ever happen on earth. We are still God's children, we all have one God, one Lord who has created us and given us life. But the word Salaam, which is used in the Islamic religion or among people of Islam as a greeting, means Peace in translation. So, you see, peace is one of the chief commandments in our two religions. [video shows Parkev talking to camera]

[Barkhatov] Azerbaijan's Fizulinskiy Rayon adjacent to NKAO. A lieutenant of the internal troops was killed while patrolling his sector and a soldier was wounded. The beginning of the investigation, as you can see, holds little promise of normal work which is required by law. [video shows several soldiers making their way through crowds of men, several times some of the men try to cover the lens of the camera with their hands; APCs moving along the street; a crowd advances along the street, soldiers shoot in the air to deter the crowd, a voice off-screen shouting "Keep calm, comrades"]

[N.N. Melnitskiy—identified by caption] I think it is very hard to carry our investigations because, for example, we in Martuninskiy Rayon have very many unsolved crimes because it is virtually impossible to find anybody.

[Barkhatov] In other words, they do not let you proceed?

[Melnitskiy] That is right.

[Barkhatov] Tell me, how often do you have to use weapons, for example, if only to shoot in the air like today? Is it the only way to deal with a crowd like that?

[Melnitskiy] Yes, only shots in the air have any effect on the crowd: We do not shoot at people, only in the air.

[Barkhatov] Have you and your lads often been under fire?

[Melnitskiy] Virtually all the soldiers have been under fire.

[Barkhatov] And they were fired upon not from hunting guns, to all appearances; submachine-guns are used, too?

[Melnitskiy] Nothing like hunting-guns; all kinds of weapons, up to machine-guns, are being used here. I do not know where they got them from. It was on our 3d day that we came under fire. We went down to an Armenian village, and there, from a distance of 25 meters, from 7 guns, practically 24 people...we let off rockets to warn them that we were soldiers, but they shot anyway.

[Barkhatov] And both sides, in Armenian villages...

[Melnitskiy] Yes, they shoot both in Armenian and in Azerbaijani villages, no difference, virtually.

Order Being Maintained

LD1601225190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Naturally all of us are now waiting for reports from the Transcaucasus and waiting for them with hope: Perhaps the situation is finally going to start changing for the better, perhaps a turning point has come. In the morning edition of the Vremya program, we broadcast—admittedly with some delay—a report by our special correspondent from Stepanakert. In the daytime edition,

I told you how the events in this hot spot are appraised by foreign correspondents, the foreign press. Throughout the day we have also been hoping to get a report from our special correspondent in Baku, but so far we have not received it for reasons which so far are unclear. It could possibly be communications problems; we are trying to sort it out.

Here is one more report, the latest one. It reminds us that in accordance with a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, a state of emergency has been introduced in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO. General (Kosolapov) has been appointed commandant. The commandant's office has started to perform the duties established by the decree. Order is being maintained on the territory of the autonomous oblast. We are waiting for more detailed reports.

And now an interview with a man upon whose shoulders lies enormous responsibility, an interview with a commanding officer who right now has to make perhaps the most difficult decisions.

[Begin recording] [Reporter Valeriy Bakarionov] How would you comment on the situation that prevails today, or even in the last few hours, in these areas?

[Yu.V. Shatalin, officer commanding interior troops of the USSR MVD, Internal Affairs Ministry] Well, during the last 24 hours there have been no unlawful actions connected with killing on interethnic grounds. The earlier losses are being sufficiently and fully reported by our mass media, radio and television, and these things are increasingly reminiscent of reports from the frontline, because large numbers of people are dying, already numbering dozens, including interior troops servicemen. This has already been reported. (Lieutenant Tsymbalyuk) has been killed, 11 servicemen are seriously injured, and 4 are missing.

[Bakarionov] You said that the mass media are reporting the prevailing situation well. I do not believe so; I believe news from those areas is coming in in limited quantities. What is that connected with?

[Shatalin] The unlawful acts on interethnic grounds are connected with excesses, pogroms, and killings. Those who incite them are afraid of the truth and, therefore, are in every way hampering the work of mass media correspondents; not only hampering them but even perpetrating excesses in respect of them. I am aware of instances of correspondents being beaten up, their equipment broken, and prevented from conveying true information about what is taking place there.

[Bakarionov] You know the operational situation, you have operational reports at your disposal. How would you connect the introduction of special measures and the prevailing concrete situation?

[Shatalin] First and foremost, it is justified by the fact that open calls to arms, as well as for setting up detachments of commandos, are being made, equally on Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic and Azerbaijani territory. This is shown by the fact that in recent days, these so-called commandos have laid their hands on 206 assault rifles, both operational and training, and more than 100 rifled weapons. And in the latest incident yesterday, the extremists even managed to capture four battle tanks during their unloading. And only thanks to resolute measures we managed to take back from them this fighting equipment, the tanks and the APCs.

[Bakarionov] Today what are the hottest spots in NKAO?

[Shatalin] The hottest spots in Nagorno-Karabakh today remain Stepanakert, Shusha, (?Agdam), Askeran, Mardakertskiy Rayon. And around it, as we say, it is the Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, that is, areas where Armenian and Azerbaijani population live together.

[Bakarionov] People are very interested in the fate of the employees of the Shaumyanovskiy Rayon party committee and the servicemen captured by the extremists. Could you say anything about their fate today?

[Shatalin] I cannot say exactly. We only have suppositions and some data that right now all of them are being held in Khanlarskiy rayon. We know for a fact that all four servicemen are injured. [end recording] [video shows reporter interviewing Shatalin in colonel-general's uniform in an office; Shatalin showing points on a map.

Principal Measures Described

LD1601200290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] And now back to home news. We have just received a very important TASS report which I shall now read to you. As we all know, in connection with the aggravation of the situation, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted a decree introducing a state of emergency on NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] territory and in adjoining areas in the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic, in Gorisskiy Rayon of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, as well as the border area along the USSR state border on Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic territory.

The principal measures provide for a ban on holding meetings, rallies, and street processions; control over the mass media; and suspension of activities by citizens' organizations and informal association, which contravene the law, or their dissolution. Also banned are strikes. There are restrictions on traveling to and from the areas, and on transport traffic, and documents are being checked. Firearms and side arms are being temporarily confiscated from citizens and, wherever necessary, also from enterprises, institutions, and organizations.

People inciting public order violations may be detained up to 30 days. Other special measures are also envisaged.

In implementing the decree, state and administration organs have already begun to take practical steps. In order to ensure public order and citizens' safety, more than 6,000 additional interior troops have been moved to the republic. To assist the MVD [Internal Affairs Ministry] forces, Soviet Army military units, numbering 5,000 men, have been sent in. Investigative operational teams of the MVD and the USSR Procurator's Service have been formed and dispatched. Commandants' offices and commandants' zones have been set up. Forty-nine inciters and pogrom perpetrators have been apprehended. Decisive and professional actions by law-enforcement details made it possible to save many lives. Major public life facilities—transport, enterprises, airports—are being put under guard. Measures are being taken to confiscate stolen weapons and find perpetrators of unlawful acts.

In connection with the critical situation in Baku, and the pogroms that have taken place and human fatalities, MVD and Soviet Army troops have reinforced local law-enforcement bodies. The USSR state border's protection has been reinforced.

At the same time, the situation remains extremely tense. In the prevailing situation many inhabitants are demanding that the authorities take further resolute measures.

Azerbaijan Leader Supports Emergency Decree

NC1601192390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Speech by Ayaz Muttalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, in Baku on 16 January—recorded]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decree on the declaration of a state of emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is of exceptional importance to our people. Through this decree, we have obstructed criminal efforts by separatist and extremist forces designed to disrupt stability and the interests of all the peoples in the Azerbaijan SSR, as well as the Azerbaijan SSR's territorial integrity.

The Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers deems that this decision will play an important role in the effort to establish a normal situation in the entire region, particularly in our republic.

The decree notes that a state of emergency has been declared in the rayons neighboring the NKAO and along the state border. I wish to emphasize in particular that a state of emergency will be declared in other places if the supremacy of the law, the safety of the citizens, and the law on the state borders are disrupted and if any armed group threatens interference.

The republic's Council of Ministers hopes that all citizens will display a high sense of organization and responsibility in the move to safeguard the republic's territorial integrity and sovereignty and to democratize and restructure Soviet society. The Council of Ministers also hopes that all citizens will work to support the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decree issued on 15 January.

Internal Affairs Ministry Briefing on Disturbances

LD1601220990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1900 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] today there was a news briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. They were informed about the operational situation in Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Nagorno-Karabakh. Our correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov reports.

[Fedorov] We were told that the situation in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic remains extremely tense. In all, ever since the start of events, since 11 January up to the present day, as of 1100, 56 people have died, including 9 of Azeri nationality, 28 of Armenian nationality, and 2 public order force members; 156 people have been injured; 167 pogroms and arson attacks have been committed. The Popular Front of Azerbaijan [PFA] has decided to block the arriving internal troops by not allocating motor vehicles to transport them. On 14 January at about 1400, in the town of Khanlar, a grenade was thrown from a passing Ural vehicle; four people were wounded. At Zazaly station on the Transcaucasian railway at about 1700, PFA members seized four tanks without ammunition, the whereabouts of which are being investigated. Instances of weapons seizure have become more frequent. In the town of Gyandzh a group of Azeris forcefully seized 82 automatic training weapons and a mortar in the agricultural institute building. The roads leading to the town have been blocked to frustrate the transfer of internal troops' subunits. The USSR MVD is adopting decisive measures to protect the population and ensure security. The contingent of internal troops and operational teams in Azerbaijan is being reinforced. Criminal charges arising from instances of crime have been filed and investigations are underway. The protection of installations housing weapons has been stepped up.

The situation in Armenia also remains extremely tense. In the course of 24 hours, 16 instances of armed attacks to capture weapons in protected installations have been registered. Such instances are recorded in Artashatskiy Rayon, where at 0230 on the night of 15 January, some 3,000 people, some with firearms, broke into the town's internal affairs department premises and seized 106 AKM assault rifles, used for training; 30 carbines; 27 (?TOS) rifles; 11 revolvers; over 3,000 rounds of ammunition; and 1 training grenade thrower. Measures are being taken to recover the stolen weapons and identify the people who committed the unlawful acts.

As for Nagorno-Karabakh, the situation there remains extremely serious. Since the conflict's beginning and up to the present day, 20 people have died and over 260 have received various injuries. Arson attacks and pogroms, including those against apartment blocks, have been committed. Firing on inhabited localities and on posts and details of the security forces has not ended, nor has hostage taking. In connection with the largescale disturbances and other crimes committed for interethnic reasons in the autonomous oblast, over 180 criminal cases are being investigated, for which over 50 people have been called to account.

Baku Situation Still 'Extremely Complex'

PM1601160990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Own special correspondent V. Litovkin telephone report under the general heading "Situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia"]

[Text] Baku, 16 Jan—Outwardly the city has changed little. As always in winter a cold northeasterly wind is blowing, driving casual passers-by off the streets. Everything seems quiet and peaceful, but the Ministry of Internal Affairs reports tell a different story. They are reminiscent of battlefield dispatches.

Groups of 10-15 people with sacks and motor vehicles have appeared in the city. They are robbing Armenians' apartments. In order to transport the goods they stop trucks and, by making threats, force the drivers to load up their booty. The escalation of violence continues. Here are some terrible figures on the "work" of these bandits—the number of ransacked apartments in the city is nearing the 1,000 mark.

In Baku's hospitals teams of medical personnel are being set up to give first aid to the injured. The aggressors and extremists even attack the apartments of officers and warrant officers.

At the Baku Garrison Headquarters I was told that at midday armed raiders in three Zhigulis had attempted to capture several training tanks on the training ground. These tanks were devoid of armaments but could have been used for hauling. And, of course, for other purposes. At Zazaly Station near Gyandzha an attempt was made to capture four tanks returning from an overhaul. During this period an officer and five soldiers were taken hostage. After resolute actions by officer R. Slaboshevich these people were released and the combat vehicles returned to their military unit.

Late yesterday evening an extraordinary party city committee [gorkom] meeting was held in Baku, in which Ye.M. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union; A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and A.-R.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist

Party Central Committee, took part. The plenum discussed urgent measures to normalize the situation in the city. It stated that criminal forces, exploiting the sharp deterioration of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjoining regions, had whipped up feelings in Baku and encouraged some people—refugees from Armenia—to take illegal actions. The plenum resolution noted that as a result of these actions a real threat to democratization and perestroika has been created.

The party gorkom appealed to the people of Baku through the press, radio, and television. The appeal states: "We should not allow our people's name to be besmirched. Bloodshed is not our way... We call for unity and common sense. Do not make ill-considered decisions; reason and conscientiousness should be our slogans...."

Refugees have been organized in the city, where the necessary conditions have been created for injured of Armenian nationality and where they are given medical aid. One such center is situated in the "Shafag" Movie Theater. It holds around 100 people. The movie theater is under militia protection.

Galina Yedigárova, one of those who has been given help, told me: "People knocked on our door late at night. They said they were members of the Azerbaijan People's Front. They helped us to pack and get ourselves ready and took us to the headquarters under guard. We were later taken to the movie theater. They got hold of some baby food for my child...."

People's Front leaders are appearing on radio and television to condemn the actions of those involved in the pogroms and to call on people to be calm and vigilant.

But there has been other news too. As a result of a seasonal mountain torrent part of the headquarters building of the Red Banner Caspian Flotilla collapsed. According to preliminary figures 16 people have been killed. Rescue work is under way. During the night the ships of the Caspian Flotilla evacuated refugees from Baku. The flotilla's training vessel evacuated 165 people to Makhachkala.

Many Armenian families are asking the military for protection. They are housed in the Baku Garrison's military accommodation and given every possible assistance. This is not always easily done—sometimes the garrison accommodation is blockaded by the extremists. They threaten the military with reprisals for helping the Armenians.

Rallies and open party meetings have been held at Baku's largest enterprises condemning the barbarity, pillage, and violence that have taken place in the city. Special workers' groups have been set up. These have taken to the streets to oppose the rampaging mob. But, nonetheless, the situation remains extremely complex.

Armenians Evacuation Continues

LD1601163390 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

Violent ethnic turmoil continues in Azerbaijan. Capital Baku has been swept by a series of pogroms, which reached their peak late on Monday. At least 56 people, most of them Armenians, have been killed and 156 wounded in the strife, according to the Soviet Interior Ministry. Activists taking part in rallies organized by grass-roots organizations in Baku demand that civilians be armed and sent to Nagorno-Karabakh.

On Sunday, local militants seized four battle tanks with crews near a rail-road station near the Azerbaijani city of Gyandzh [former Kirovabad].

Today, the tanks were confiscated by authorities. Civilians in the city are arming themselves, erecting road blocks to prevent Interior Ministry troops from reaching the place.

Late on January 14, the Seidlyar settlement in Azerbaijan was fired upon by Armenians on the other side of the border, according to the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry. At least 300 lorries with militants have gathered in Azerbaijani areas bordering with Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia.

On Monday, large amounts of explosives were discovered in two rail carriages on their way from the urals to Armenia near the Julfa rail station in Azerbaijan.

The evacuation of Armenians from Baku continues. About 2,000 people have been evacuated by ferry and plane in the past two days. Out of the 220,000 Armenians who used to live in Baku, only several thousand remain there, according to the Armenian permanent representation in Moscow.

Azerbaijan continues its rail blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Tensions are running high in areas bordering on Nagorno-Karabakh. About 2,000 people armed with anti-hail and air defence guns are situated on hills, dominating the area. Reports coming from Nagorno-Karabakh's capital Stepanakert deny earlier reports that civilians have been fired on from Armenians on helicopters.

The Soviet aviation minister has banned flights of civilian helicopters in Armenia and Azerbaijan. The order is being observed. It appears that a military helicopter opened retaliatory fire on militants, and not civilians as has been reported, when they attacked it with anti-hail and sub-machine gun fire.

In Yerevan, guarded objects have been attacked, according to reports. A total of 1,642 guns and more than 30,000 cartridges of ammunition have been captured.

The National Council of Nagorno-Karabakh called on all people in the area to be ready to repel any invasion, according to a statement published in Stepanakert today. "There is a need for a general mobilisation of forces and means to protect the population. In the current extreme situation, hasty actions and the dissemination of panicky rumours are inadmissible," it said. "It is necessary to create the necessary conditions for troops deployed to prevent armed conflicts."

Residents in Nagorno-Karabakh have expressed understanding over the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decision to introduce emergency situation in the area. They hope that increasing numbers of Interior Ministry troops arriving in the region will help protect civilians lives.

3300 Armenians Depart 15 Jan

NC1701093090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] Our correspondent Firuz Akhmetly will acquaint you with a report by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs:

[Begin recording] It is common knowledge that interethnic relations in our republic have recently been strained. In view of this [words indistinct]. A number of bodies were discovered yesterday in Baku, where the situation remains very serious. Four of them were identified. All were of Armenian origin.

Many people have been injured. About 40 were injured during the day. Inquiry groups have been established as a result of these developments. The investigation is continuing.

In view of the tension in interethnic relations, more than 3,300 Armenians departed from Baku by air or in ferry boats and other means of transportation yesterday. Militia Captain Malik Islamov, chief of the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Operations Department, informed me that the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] remained tense as well. A number of houses in (?Kirkidzhevan) town, which is an Azerbaijani town near Stepanakert, were destroyed by fire yesterday. Armed Armenian extremists have completely surrounded (?Dagdagly) town in (?Markuni) rayon. Meanwhile, hundreds of vehicles and thousands of people have been observed to have gathered at a number of points in the Armenian SSR close to the territories of the Lachinskiy and Kubatlinskiy rayons. Armenian extremists opened fire on Zangelan from the direction of Kafanskiy rayon and on (?Khakhly) town in Lachinskiy rayon from (?Khoznavat) town in Gorisskiy rayon.

No one was wounded in Zangelanskiy rayon. However, one person was killed and another was injured in (?Khakhly) in Lachinskiy rayon.

Comrade Islamov later said that the situation was tense in Khanlarskiy rayon. He added that a number of people

have been killed and wounded as a result of the clashes in Shaumyanskiy and Khanlarskiy rayons. Meanwhile, attacks are continuing uninterruptedly against Nakhichevan's borders with Armenia. Armed Armenian groups attacked [name indistinct] town in Il'ichevskiy rayon at about 0800 yesterday. Five houses were set on fire. The arrival of the internal affairs units halted the attacks of the Armenian extremists.

Large quantities of explosives have been discovered in the [name indistinct] railway station in Nakhichevan hidden among the construction materials in the railway freight cars bound for Armenia's Araratskiy rayon. Flights and railway transportation between Azerbaijan and Armenia have not been operating during the past few days. [end recording]

Yerevan Delivery of Arms to NKAO Reported

NC1601145690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] AZERINFORM correspondents' reports about the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], Nakhichevan, and [word indistinct] appear in today's newspapers. The reports say that 2 homemade (?mines), 1 automatic weapon, 17 rifles, and various types of explosives were discovered in the cargo delivered to Stepanakert by a Yak-40 aircraft which flies from Yerevan to Stepanakert. (?Kerkidzhivan) town was attacked on the night of 14-15 January.

Meanwhile, disturbing reports have come in from (?Khodzhevend) town in [name indistinct] rayon. (?Transportation links) between Agdam and Shusha have been disrupted. The movement of railway freight cars on the Nakhichevan-Megri section of the railroad network has been halted. The groups set up to protect property in the region are patrolling stores, bakeries, [word indistinct], hospitals, schools, and bus and railroad stations. The men are obstructing all unlawful activities and [words indistinct].

Primakov, Girenko, Vezirov Hold Talks in Baku

LD1601195690 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 16 Jan 90

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrades Primakov, Girenko, and Vezirov this morning met with workers from all sections of the law enforcement bodies of the city of Baku. Specific directions were determined for work on providing for the preservation of order everywhere and for taking action or giving help to people who have fallen on misfortune. Instructions were given in the most decisive manner, making use of all means available to stop criminal actions.

A pointed conversation took place at the Council of Ministers of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic.

Tasks for stabilizing the situation were placed before leaders of ministries and departments and of major industrial associations and enterprises of the republic.

In an atmosphere of an open and honest exchange of opinions a press conference took place at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, during which Comrade Primakov and Vezirov answered numerous questions of representatives of the central and republican press and of radio and television.

The need for an objective explanation of the events in the region and a considered approach toward them was noted.

Comrade Girenko met and had a conversation with the leaders of women's organizations in the republic.

Give News Conference

*NC1701111790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[Text] A news conference was held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee today in connection with the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decree on the declaration of a state of emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and other rayons and with the existing situation in the republic. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union; and Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, replied to the questions that were put to them by journalists.

Vezirov Discusses Azerbaijan's 'Sovereign' Rights

*NC1401110190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The people of Azerbaijan are tired of having to point out that their stand in the present disorderly situation is justified and that they have the right to own their own land. The settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem has been delayed for 2 years. The supreme legislative and executive organs in the country have adopted many decisions during this period of time and repeatedly confirmed that borders cannot be changed and that the neighboring republic's claims for land are illegal. However, decisions have not been consolidated with concrete work. Many times they have not been put into effect.

The open meeting Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, held with the workers and employees of the Baku electrical equipment production union discussed this state of affairs and other problems. Vezirov gave explicit replies to the most urgent questions, explained his stand, and detailed the steps taken to realize the plans that have been drawn up to establish Azerbaijan's sovereign rights.

Vezirov also discussed in detail matters related to the question of eliminating the dispute on the USSR-Iran border. He explained the measures that are being put into effect to simplify acquainting the relatives who have been separated by the Aras River. Vezirov also discussed the perspectives of improving tourism, border trade, and cultural relations between Azerbaijan and Iran.

You can read about all this in the front pages of the newspapers.

Baku Popular Front Organizes Brigades

*NC1601144190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Today's newspapers publish a disclosure made by the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs. Kuliyeu, member of the Executive Committee of the Popular Front in Nesimi Rayon, said that brigades have been established and guard duties have been organized around the clock in all the rayon branches of the Popular Front. The brigades, made up of 15 members each, are helping their militia colleagues. The Popular Front of Azerbaijan is trying with all its strength to have law and order and security restored in Baku.

Baku Workers Demand Public Order

*NC1601153890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union; Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, arrived in Baku in connection with the incidents in Baku on 13 January. The situation is being controlled through efforts by the republic's party, soviet, and law enforcement organs.

The collectives of the establishments in Baku that have maintained uninterrupted work have held meetings. The workers categorically condemned the behavior of the organizers of ('unlawful') activities and demanded the strengthening of law and public order in Baku.

Baku Deputies Condemn Armenian Decision

*NC1401105890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The newspapers report on the extraordinary meeting that has been held by the Baku City People's Deputies Soviet. The convocation examined the anticonstitutional decisions adopted by the Armenian Soviet

Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session in connection with Azerbaijan SSR's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

The meeting participants categorically condemned the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet's lawless activities. Furthermore, the meeting adopted a unanimous decision which described the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session's anticonstitutional and unauthorized decision as grossly violating the USSR Constitution and Azerbaijan SSR's sovereign rights.

Azeri Papers View NKAO Organization Committee

NC1301130990 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
0440 GMT 13 Jan 90

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The new papers report that the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee continues its work in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Members of the organization committee Polyanichko, Radayev, Velimamedov, and Kerimov visited [name indistinct] town in (?Dobruskiy) Rayon, Karadagly Town in (?Nesimi) Rayon and the (?Kushlu) state farm in Shushaskiy Rayon. Fulfilling the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the NKAO problem was discussed during the meetings.

A meeting was held in Shusha on 12 January. The directors of the state and collective farms in the rural areas inhabited by Azerbaijanis in the NKAO, secretaries of the primary party organizations, the heads of the local soviets, and a number of the leading officials of the republic's ministries and main administrations participated in the meeting. Matters related to the question of quickly normalizing the situation in the NKAO were discussed during the meeting.

Azeris Accuse Armenia of 'Declaring War'

LD1601153190 *Kuwait KUNA in English* 1410 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, Jan 16 (KUNA)—Ethnic clashes between Azeris and Armenians in the restive areas of Azerbaijan continued today as the central authorities moved to control the situation after declaring a state of emergency in the region last night. [passage omitted]

A representative for the Azeris Popular Front today accused Armenia of declaring war on Azerbaijan Republic and charged that the Armenians were "using helicopter gunships to shell Azerbaijani areas."

In a telephone call with KUNA office in the Soviet capital, the representative, who requested anonymity, also accused the central Soviet media of "distorting facts and presenting an inaccurate picture of the situation" in the region.

He accused the Soviet authorities of failing to protect the Azeris against Armenian attacks and described the clashes in Baku, where 33 Armenians have been killed, as "fabricated and provocations which the (Moscow) authorities want to use as pretext to destroy the Popular Front."

The front's representative said they had appealed to Baku citizens not to be dragged into the campaign of hostility against the Armenians and held some KGB agents and Azerbaijani criminals of undertaking the killings and attacks on Armenians. [as received]

He disclosed that yesterday's talks between the front's leadership and Primakov in Baku dealt with normalization of the situation and opening of the city's airport for domestic flights. He expressed fears that the opening of the airport would be used in sending military troops to the city to attack the Popular Front.

The front's representative claimed that the population of Azerbaijan have lost confidence in the communist party and eventually powers had "actually moved in a number of cities to the popular front."

Armenian Claims Against Azerbaijan Refuted

NC1601164890 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
1700 GMT 15 Jan 90

[S. Mamedov commentary]

[Text] Modern arms have been sent from Armenia to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and to the other areas inhabited by Armenians in our republic for nearly 2 years now. This is why architectural monuments and social buildings in the NKAO and in the republic's rayons bordering Armenia have been destroyed nearly every day. It is impossible to (?understand) the situation of the people of Shusha and other Azerbaijani towns. What is most regrettable is that all of this has happened with the direct participation of the government of Armenia and before the eyes of our republic's government and the central government. When will the uncontrollable Armenian extremists be stopped?

The operations group of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs disclosed a few days ago that a large quantity of arms have been discovered in the NKAO. Two hand-made (?mines), [word indistinct], 17 rifles, and various types of explosives were discovered in the cargo delivered to Stepanakert by a YAK-40 aircraft which flies between Yerevan and Stepanakert. This is not the first time. It is easy to believe that the Armenian extremists are arming themselves on a large scale. Against whom are they arming themselves?

The Armenian nationalists are waging a [word indistinct] ideological and [word indistinct] campaign against the Azerbaijani people. They are trying to fill the minds of the people of the union and the world with defamatory information against the people of Azerbaijan. This is

being done in two ways. The first is through the (?Tashnak) Party, which is the (?guardian) of the Armenian nationalists and the second is through the Armenian and central mass media organs, particularly through individuals within the framework of the central television who comply with the instructions of the Armenian mafia organization. This viewpoint can be confirmed by an analysis of the cast that was screened on the Seven Days program about the situation in the region on central television yesterday. The journalists who explained the undesirable incident in Baku on 13 January said that his communist conscience and credibility as a journalist do not allow him to overlook what has happened. This should be appreciated. Is this not a requirement of openness? However, to what extent can considering one's credibility and hearing one's communist conscience only in favor of one of the sides comply with the norms of morality? Let those who prepare objective programs consider this. Objective individuals should realize what is right.

I would like to say the following to my colleague: Where was his communist conscience when he failed to tell the truth to the people when nearly 200,000 Azerbaijanis were expelled from Armenia under [words indistinct] and tragic conditions? Would his credibility not suffer as a result of his failure to assess the truth objectively and convey accurate reports to the people under the conditions of democracy and openness on the daily unjustified bloodshed in the NKAO and in Azerbaijan's border rayons? Under these conditions, what ties do such individuals have with the party tickets they carry in their pockets?

The journalist said that the meeting held by 300,000 people in Yerevan noted that rumors should be avoided, but the meeting held by 150,000 people in Baku called for the expulsion of the Armenians from the city. Can this be described as anything else but a lie and a calumny?

Azerbaijan State of Emergency Viewed

*PM1701125990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Article by Albert Plutnik: "State of Emergency"]

[Text] A state of emergency is an emergency measure, it cannot be denied. In the cities and rayons of one of our country's republics which was invariably called a sunny and flowering republic, which for so long lived in the consciousness of millions as an example of internationalism and the friendship of the peoples, it may be said that people will live according to wartime laws. Freedom of movement is restricted and road checks and a curfew are being introduced. These measures also extend to one rayon of the neighboring republic.

In brief, freedom is being restricted. For instance, freedom of assembly and meetings and street demonstrations, which will now be restricted on the territory where the state of emergency is in operation, as will freedom of

the press—the mass media are being put under special control. No other way out remained.

Nagorno-Karabakh, which has become our common misfortune and pain, and all Azerbaijan, since the time of Sumgait, has for more than a year now been attracting the country's alarmed attention. Time passed, but calm did not return to that land which in our time has become a long-suffering one. Fellow countrymen, yesterday's good friends and neighbors, Azerbaijanis and Armenians, are killing each other. A terrible reality of our day is that people are being killed solely because they are Armenians or Azerbaijanis. Some 2 years after the Sumgait events the Baku events have ensued.

No, no one has the right to reproach the leadership for displaying impatience and lack of restraint in these circumstances. The leadership perhaps even contented itself for too long with political means—you recall how many deputies and delegations were sent to the place of the "hostilities" for meetings and talks which failed to produce tangible results. They counted on the common sense of all those taking part in the conflict. The leadership retained restraint even when the "rails war" erupted and a blockade of the railroad was undertaken, essentially an attempt at the economic blockade of a neighboring sovereign republic which had only just suffered one of the most terrible tragedies in the history of mankind. Although those who were involved in this could not fail to understand that they were essentially blocking progressive changes and cutting off paths toward their peaceful and successful course. And not only in their own region. An unprecedented action was attempted at the time—the storm of our southern borders, not from outside, as has often happened, but from within, which has never happened. Although those who did this must have understood that they were essentially storming perestroika.

It must be noted that the pitch of passions has been heated on both sides. Decisions were taken in which emotional principles blatantly prevailed over sensible principles and symbolic motives prevailed over realistic ones. Whatever motives guided them here, objectively the result was that more and more gasoline was poured on the fire of the conflict and now the flames have begun to roar, reducing further human lives to ashes.

As a result the matter went too far—the sides are essentially waging local battles using submachineguns, machine guns, and antiaircraft artillery. Attempts have been made to seize leaders of local organs of power as hostages. Restricting oneself in this situation merely to political means became tantamount to nonintervention and the failure to adopt more resolute measures became tantamount to indifference to the fate of the two peoples and connivance with the actions of those who are playing with their fate. In other words, the state of emergency was needed exclusively for the purpose of preventing further bloodshed, for the purpose of safeguarding human rights and above all the main human right—the right to life. There are probably cases where force

becomes the most palpable argument in favor of humanism and is undoubtedly the most palpable argument in favor of appeasement, of the cooling of excessively heated passions.

If, thanks to the decree, we succeed in saving the life of even one person over whom the threat of death has hung or could hang, then this measure taken by the center will have justified itself.

Today we are talking a lot about the republics' rights and about their real and alleged sovereignty. But do our republics always use even those rights upon which no one is infringing? Not always. Why? We find it hard to answer. We can merely note the fact with regret. The local authorities have been unable even to protect citizens from the murderers' knives and bullets. Who in that case had to defend the people? Who had to bar the way to possible new crimes? Who had to ensure the normal course of life in that part of our country?

A difficult decision was taken. But democratic processes will continue to gather strength. In the light of the tragic events, in the light of interethnic conflicts in this and other regions, it is becoming more noticeable what difficulties—not only natural but also artificial—are accumulating on the path of perestroika. Whatever arguments you cite, these events themselves are objectively delaying the transformations proceeding in the country and contain the possibility of forcing perestroika as it were to fight on several fronts, to divert substantial efforts from urgent civilian matters and from urgent concerns for the improvement of the country's economic state and people's welfare.

It is clear that it is above all the ordinary people who are suffering in the conflict. Everyone understands that this is not the deed of the people, no people can be interested in death, chaos, and discord. The echo of the conflict is sounding throughout the country. It is well known how deep economic integration goes in our country. Consequently a drastic reduction in economic activity in one region is immediately felt in many others. And nonetheless it is losses of a different nature—political and moral—which are far more substantial. There are more frequently attempts to blame precisely the new course, the new thinking, for the emergence and aggravation of events. It may be supposed that with the introduction of the state of emergency yesterday will again be set up as an example for today, as has already often happened in the past: People will say that yesterday there was nothing like that, they did a proper job... But there are no forces which could now return us to the past, however vividly some people may portray its advantages—we were alive then and we saw everything with our own eyes.

Perestroika must defend itself. And it is not to blame for the fact that it has to defend itself and others with the aid of emergency measures. Were it defenseless, this would generate everywhere a sense of oppression, of uncertainty for the future, which can in no way be allowed.

Lenkoran People's Front Statement on Takeover

PM1401113290 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 90 p 1

[Report by own special correspondent O. Shapovalov under the general heading "Transcaucasus, 12 January": "Lenkoran"]

[Text] Lenkoran radio has broadcast a message by the People's Front of Lenkoran. It reads verbatim: "Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, in connection with the question of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and the nonobservance of the republic's rights, the People's Front of Lenkoran is suspending the actions of the soviet authorities in the city as of 11 January. A 'Provisional Defense Committee' is being set up to replace the central authority in the city and maintain public order; it will perform the following tasks:

"1. The People's Front does not recognize the republic organs of soviet power because of its violating the people's constitutional rights and offending the national conscience, honor, and territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan people.

"2. After the adoption of measures by the organs of power of the republic, the committee ceases to be valid."

Judging by information received, authority in Lenkoran is being exercised by the provisional defense committee. The rayon party committee, the rayon soviet executive committee, and the city radio have been seized. Several hundred shotguns previously confiscated by law-enforcement agencies have been handed out to the population by People's Front representatives.

More Troops To Be Sent to Armenia

NC1701121990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0545 GMT 17 Jan 90

[From Review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] On its last page the paper publishes a statement by the chief of the Yerevan garrison, which says: In line with the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the introduction of a state of emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and a number of other regions, additional units of troops will soon arrive in Armenia. They will discharge the responsibilities placed on them by the 15 January 1990 decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and will assist the Armenian people in stabilizing the situation.

Curfew Imposed in Azerbaijan Localities

NC1601180090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1715 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] We were just informed by telex that a curfew has been introduced in Baku. Our reliable sources have informed us that additional forces have been sent to the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. At 0100 on

16 January a special forces brigade arrived in Shaumyanskiy to patrol Khanlarskiy Rayon together with the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's (?Minsk) regiment.

Another column of the brigade has passed Stepanakert and is moving toward Lachin and Kubatlu. They have been allowed to use USSR Army technical facilities in order to strengthen the USSR Internal Ministry's internal forces.

Curfew was also introduced today in the five rayons of Azerbaijan SSR—Shaumyanskiy, Khanlarskiy, Lachinskiy, (Sizulu) and Agdamski, and the question of introducing a special military situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's Kubatlu, Zangelani, (Mir Bashli), and other rayons is being discussed.

During the past 3 days, about 2000 refugees have arrived in the Armenian SSR from the Azerbaijan SSR. According to figures published by the permanent Armenian SSR representation in Moscow, on the same day 600 refugees arrived in Moscow from Baku. The flight of refugees continues.

Armenian Leadership Holds Extraordinary Meeting

NC160120090 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1630 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] The republic's residents are concerned about the disorderly acts that have been perpetrated against Armenians for several days now by the Popular Front of Azerbaijan and other forces. The situation is extremely tense.

For this reason an extraordinary meeting was held in the republic of the Armenian Communist party Central Committee, the Presidium of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, and the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers which is chaired by Vladimir Movsisyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers.

The session included representatives of party, soviet, law-enforcement, responsible, and popular bodies and organizations.

An ARMENPRES correspondent went to the operative session and received the following report.

By 1400 on 15 January, the situation was extremely tense. It is true that compared with the past 2 days the tension had eased a little, but it is still far from being normal. If the clashes 2 days ago were only in Azerbaijan's Shaumyanskiy Rayon and Getashen Subrayon Armenian villages, according to latest reports, tense situations have been created in Meghru, Goris, (?Ararat), [name indistinct], (?Noyemberyan), and Idzhevan.

A series of effective measures are being taken in the republic to ensure the Armenian inhabitants' safety. The situation that has been created demands respect for order, sagacity, and unity.

Communications Link Discussed

NC1601201490 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] An ARMENPRES correspondent reports from the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee operative session, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, saying that on the night of 15 January and the dawn of 16 January the situation was relatively calm in the explosive areas, with the exception of Azat village in Getashen. During the night armed Azerbaijani extremist groups carried out several raids on this Armenian village. However, they received the retaliation they deserved from the internal forces and retreated. Fourteen slightly wounded people were transferred from Shaumyanskiy and Getashen villages to Yerevan hospitals. All the wounded received the necessary treatment.

During the operative session the establishment of telephone or radio links with the Armenian-inhabited areas in Azerbaijan was discussed. These links are extremely necessary in order to receive reports, since there was no contact between the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's [NKA] Martakert and Hadruyt with either Yerevan or Stepanakert. The Telecommunications Ministry was assigned to start immediate measures to establish radio links with the said areas. Various other basic organizations were also assigned to supply food, [word indistinct], and other essential products to the residents of Shaumyanskiy, the Armenian-inhabited villages in Getashen, and the NKA without delay.

On 16 January the operative session discussed ways to extend basic assistance to the first groups of refugees from Azerbaijan and to provide them with houses and jobs temporarily. Thirty-nine refugee families have found refuge in the (?hospitable) homes of Vardenis residents.

11-13 Jan Armenian Supreme Soviet Session

NC1601132990 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 15 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 15 Jan (ARMENPRES)—The 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet continued its deliberations between 11 and 13 January. G. Voskanyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, briefed the joint session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and National Council of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKA] about the new decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium concerning the unprecedented barbaric actions at the Nakhichevan sector of the Soviet-Iranian border and a number of decisions and legislative acts adopted by the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet and the Armenian Supreme Soviet connected with the developments in and around NKA. [passage omitted]

The session debated the timetable for the election of the people's deputies of the Armenian Soviet Socialist

Republic [SSR] and of local soviets of people's deputies. The draft submitted by the committee was approved by majority vote and it was decided that the elections for people's deputies of the Armenian SSR and the elections for local soviets should be held on different dates.

The draft constitutional article concerning the method of electing the chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet drew heated debate. The committee (?proposed) that the chairman should be elected by the Supreme Soviet. This proposal was endorsed by the deputies. It was also decided that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet should be chosen from among two or more candidates.

The deputies could not come to a conclusion about how many deputies are to make up the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet after reductions are made. It was decided to refer the matter to the deputies' committee for further study.

The deliberations on the introduction of amendments and supplements to the Armenian SSR Constitution (the Basic Law) were largely completed except for several articles. Proposals on these articles were also sent back to the deputies' committee for comprehensive examination.

The deputies then examined and approved a number of articles in the Armenian SSR draft law concerning the election of people's deputies of the Armenian SSR.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet then had to suspend deliberations at the session until further notice due to the tense situation prevailing in the region.

Slyunkov Meets Armenian Intellectuals, Departs

*NC1601192990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1700 GMT 16 Jan 90*

[Text] On 15 January Slyunkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held a meeting at the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Communist Party Central Committee with the representatives of creative and scientific-technical intellectuals.

He briefed the participants in detail on the situation that has been created in the region and spoke about the measures that the Soviet Government is taking to normalize the situation and to ensure the safety of the Armenians living in Azerbaijan as well as in ensuring the normal operation of Armenia's economy.

Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, was also present at the meeting.

Slyunkov left for Moscow later that same day with Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

More details on the meeting at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee will be reported in tomorrow's press.

USSR Envoy Briefs Va'ez on Azerbaijan Events

*LD1601180790 Tehran IRNA in English 1645 GMT
16 Jan 90*

[Text] Tehran, Jan. 16, IRNA—Soviet Ambassador in Tehran Vladimir Gudev today briefed Deputy Foreign Minister for Euro-American affairs Mahmud Va'ez on the latest development in Soviet Azerbaijan.

He said, a state of emergency has been declared in some parts of the Caucasus including Azerbaijan since Monday to "defend people's lives and put an end to the ethnic bloodshed."

Gudev, referring to the "prudent" stance taken by the Islamic Republic on the Azerbaijan issue, announced that the Soviet deputy foreign minister is to visit Teheran to finalize agreements on necessary facilities for cross-borders travels between the two neighbours.

Soviet Azerbaijanis who share a common religion, language and culture with their bretheren in Iran, are demanding facilities for visiting the Islamic Republic in order to make pilgrimage to holy sites and to see long-separated families and friends.

Va'ez, who was in Moscow last week, expressed "concern" over news reaching from the Caucasus. "We believe," he added, "peaceful settlement of disputes and paying attention to people's demands will avert any violent clashes," he told the Soviet ambassador.

He emphasized Iran's foreign policy principle of "non-interference in other's internal affairs" and thought that any kind of violence was bound to have detrimental impacts on the current developments. The Iranian official laid stress on self-control in settling the affairs peacefully.

In view of its good relations with Moscow, said Va'ez, Tehran is ready to make the maximum efforts for helping the Soviet Union resolve the present problem.

He also expressed readiness to establish bilateral cultural ties, in order to facilitate cross-border travels.

The Islamic Republic hopes that the problems besetting the region would be solved through "prudent and peaceful" policies so that the people could live in peace.

Soviet Azeris Continue to Cross Border 16 Jan

*LD1701084890 Tehran IRNA in English 0612 GMT
17 Jan 90*

[Text] Pol Dasht, East Azarbayjan Prov., Jan. 17, IRNA—Soviet Azeri Muslims who cross the border river Aras (Araks) continued to arrive in Pol Dasht and Zanganeh regions of the East Azarbayjan Province Tuesday.

More Soviet Azeris are pouring into the area crossing the river by boats and other floating objects.

A group of 36 Soviet Muslims who had reached the Iranian side of the river during the past few days, returned home Tuesday.

The latest group who arrived here are mainly put up at a stadium equipped with the necessary facilities.

More Than 30 Cross

LD1601132490 Tehran IRNA in English 1255 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Poldasht, East Azarbayjan Prov., Jan. 16, IRNA—Braving a state of emergency declared by Moscow on the border strip of the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan and Iran, more than 30 Muslim Azeris have crossed the Aras border river and arrived here since early Tuesday.

They said they had crossed the river to visit their relatives and get acquainted with the Iranian life style.

Meanwhile, sporadic gatherings by Soviet Azeris who were standing along the river bank until 1500 hours local time [1130 GMT], were held.

More Reportage on Gorbachev Speeches in Lithuania

11 Jan Speech to Fuel Workers

PM1201195590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jan 90 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report on 11 January M.S. Gorbachev visit to Vilnius production association: "Our Common Problems Have To Be Resolved in Common"]

[Text] On 11 January M.S. Gorbachev visited a fuel industry equipment production association in Vilnius, where he met with workers in the shops and made a speech to the enterprise labor collective in the plant clubhouse.

Even this visit to your plant and the brief conversations here, M.S. Gorbachev said, have enabled me to learn a lot, experienced though I am in politics. And in fact the reaction in the auditorium during my conversation with you shows that pluralism of opinions is, so to speak, right here. It is one thing that we have plenty of.

So, dear friends, I am glad to be here, on Lithuanian soil, in your collective. My work schedule has allocated 3 days to my stay here, in the republic. I attach great importance to my visit to you. On the one hand it has been a very long-held wish, because I was last in Lithuania—for the first and the last time—9 years and 6 months ago, so people here have calculated. I took that calculation as a hint, of course. So I came to an understanding with the leaders of your republic that in the winter or early spring months I was to come to the republic. But events are developing at such a tempestuous pace in our country, all

the processes are accelerating so fast, and indeed the events that have occurred here among you have provoked such repercussions and responses, such reflections and anxieties that I was prompted to come sooner. You know that this was also the opinion of the party Central Committee plenum, the results of which you know—that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary should come here at the earliest possible date.

So here I am. What we are currently seeing from Moscow and what the first meetings here in Vilnius also show, inter alia, is evidence that the perestroika processes are moving at tremendous speed in your republic. But I must tell you that they are moving at tremendous speed throughout the country. It is very important for us at this watershed, at this fateful time for our peoples and for the vast country for which destiny has reserved a unique history—it is very important, dear comrades, not just to maintain direction but to reach our intended goals with the minimum losses. What is happening within the perestroika framework, which has assumed such a tumultuous character, is accompanied by painful phenomena both in human relationships and in the economy, the social sphere, interethnic relations, and the spheres of ideology, culture, and language. What are these—are they consequences of perestroika? What are they—only the beginning of alarming trends which are going to grow and complicate the situation in the country and in every collective? Or is this simply a time of great reflections and discussions, in which we are clarifying our history and our present life, appraising our plans, and renouncing the old and moving on to the new in all spheres of society's life?

I tell you unequivocally that the problems have been mounting up for decades. Perestroika has created an atmosphere of openness [otkrytost], glasnost, and democratization and, ultimately, it has created a situation in which we have all started to have our say. Perestroika has illuminated our problems, it has sharpened them. Having been given more information and access to everything, people began to ponder: Why did it happen that way? And then—why try to conceal it—they looked for people to call to account: and found them. And they began to ask—that was the most important thing, I believe—what we are to do now.

So, the first thing is this: We need perestroika. It is a good thing that it began, albeit belatedly. We spent a year or two holding rallies, then we started devising policy on the basis of the opinions and appraisals revealed. That also took some time. I would say that perestroika really started, really dates from 1989, when we actually began the processes both in altering our economy and in changing the political system. You probably recall how I spent the first, second, and third years constantly appealing along the lines that nothing would come of our plans if we just stopped at making appraisals, expressing opinions, even elaborating good policy. Nothing would come of them until the people themselves were involved in all the processes: political, economic, cultural, and so forth. Because it was already happening that we were not

starting a single reform, because each time it petered out, with everything passing through the rally stages and then going back to square one. We cannot allow that to happen again now. Because the whole world has been drawn into profound changes, indeed they have been proceeding apace for the past decade, sometimes taking on an acute social and political backdrop. You all recall how, after the oil crisis in the early seventies, the West implemented a structural perestroika, adopting radical measures at a rapid pace, to adapt to the new situation. Tens of millions of people were thrown onto the streets without employment, and many, many old plants and coal mines were closed down. We believed that this did not concern us at all. We were a country with tremendous resources, we wallowed in resources, we were profligate with them, and this served to cover all our defects and all our mismanagement. By this we saved our own bacon and we saved face. Moreover, we progressed not only by exploiting natural resources and on the basis of increasing manpower resources, but even used these resources for striking bargains, took advantage of the situation on the oil market, and world market conditions. But suddenly we had to move further to the north to the back of beyond, to the east, to get these resources, to lay new lines of communications, and to open up new regions. As a result each step in building up resources began to cost our whole complex very dear. That is the first point. Second, when the decline set in in the increase in labor resources—while we had to increase production—we realized that we had devoted ourselves very scantily to real scientific and technical progress. When the West has engaged in modernization and structural policy, we have also admitted that we need to do this and we started preparing a plenum. We conducted an analysis and we took fright. And to this day that report for the plenum and a sack of information materials are lying in the party Central Committee as evidence of the fact that we, though we realized 15-17 years ago that it was necessary to make an abrupt turn, nevertheless did not make that turn. Yes, the older generation, especially the Communists, will most likely recall how L.I. Brezhnev proclaimed that we, he said, are marching toward a plenum on questions of scientific and technical policy, of scientific and technical progress. That was when Rome was already ablaze [Vot kogda uzhe gorelo!]. That was when the time for perestroika was already ripe, that was when global problems already needed to be tackled. They were not tackled.

As for the West, having restructured itself, it embarked on resource-savings and as a result of this oil prices fell. And not just oil prices. We started losing foreign currency and consequently curtailing the opportunities not only to achieve technological progress but also to acquire basic goods for the people. Now that oil prices have fallen by a factor of 2.5-3, we are losing at least \$7 billion in hard currency a year. Converted to our domestic prices, this is the equivalent of R70 billion. It was all this, taken together, that led to such a serious situation. It must also be added that we had to face problems concerning ecology, culture, and language, problems

concerning the situation of peoples, large and small, and of the republics. And so, comrades, we approached a situation whereby life cannot continue in the same way. It became necessary to restructure ourselves. But we did not realize this at once, and thought that only partial changes were needed. You may recall that the slogan of "Acceleration through scientific and technical progress" was raised at the onset of perestroika. We started elaborating programs, we worked out a program to reconstruct Soviet industry, and doubled the share of electronics so as to pave the way for scientific and technical progress. But the cause still seems to be bogged down, and is not being grasped by the economy and by the labor collectives. What is the problem? The problem is that this is the nature of the cost-related system of relations, this is the situation of people and enterprises. When an enterprise is geared to gross output it is doomed to chase after more rather than less resources, to boost this gross output by greater rather than smaller labor resources and expenditures. This is why we spend 20-25 percent, and times even 50-100 percent more per unit of national income than the developed countries. It appears that the resources available today could provide at least one-third and even one-half as much of everything for the people.

And so we started to turn about, but later saw that the present system of economic management rejects these approaches. Then we realized—and proclaimed: We need a radical economic reform, a reform of ownership relations, and so on. We started tackling these matters, and we see that this process is also being held back. By whom? By the administrative-edict system. A mighty system which has fettered the whole of society inside its straitjacket, as if in chains. We thus arrived at the conclusion that, unless we demolish this system, we will not achieve any advance—in any direction. We thus arrived at political reform. In other words, as perestroika moved on, and as a result of an analysis of events and interconnections along all avenues of our policy, we realized that we need a considered and comprehensive concept of perestroika. The task and objective was to reveal our society's potential.

Yes, comrades, few other states possess a tremendous potential like ours. We have vast natural resources, we have vast land, forest, and water resources, even though we have damaged a lot. We have an educated people and mighty scientific resources. But all this, generally speaking, started marking time, losing the initiative, and resulted in that stagnation which is dangerous for any society. This is why all this had—figuratively speaking—to have a bomb detonated under it. This is why, if someone wants now—with the situation in the country becoming more complex—to blame perestroika, this, comrades, would be a most profound mistake and delusion. It is very important that we all should realize this. This is because, proceeding from such conclusions, appraisals, and delusions, voices can already be heard saying that it is supposedly time to put an end "to this perestroika." Let us once more issue edicts about everything, let us order everyone about. No, this will be totally

useless, since the administrative-edict system has exhausted itself. It has entered in an insoluble contradiction with society's accumulated intellectual potential. It holds everything back. The question is the same one which faced the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the past: Who will defeat whom? And so, it is necessary to demolish this system. It will be lamented only by those who were safe and secure under that system.

Were we always clever when we embarked on perestroika? I think that the time has already come to talk of our own work and appraise it. Of course, there are blunders, and primarily the fact that perestroika was conceived as a concept encompassing an entire package of measures and avenues, but it was implemented in fits and starts. We gave autonomy to enterprises but did not work out everything that ensued from this. And what was the outcome? Having gained autonomy, many enterprises started worrying primarily about their own interests. Why should I produce—speaking of light industry enterprises, for example—20 categories of output? Let me produce just three categories—it will be easier, specialization will progress more quickly, there will be less retooling, and so on. But what is the difference between 20 and 3 categories of output? This means that a range of 20 categories would meet the needs of the elderly, of children, and of young people, but today everything that is disadvantageous and unprofitable has been cast aside. And especially everything that is cheap. Profits have started growing well, but society has gained nothing from this. This is what autonomy has cost us. To continue. People have started piling up profits and wages. During the first 11 months of last year, wages increased by approximately 13 percent while labor productivity increased by 5%.

Therefore, while producing less, or rather while ensuring slower growth of output, we are earning more. But who needs wages growth unless it is accompanied by growth of the end results of productive labor? Therefore, money is circulating and accumulating, the market is in a state of imbalance. This money, combined with our mistakes and errors when conducting the antialcohol campaign—all this led to our market being in turmoil.

Yes, comrades, we created a new political atmosphere, the atmosphere of glasnost. People have an opportunity to speak out, to uphold their positions, they feel that they are citizens—this process is under way. All this is well and good, the country needs this. This is because man must, first and foremost, feel like a man. After all, the ultimate goal of our labor to lead a human life and reveal the potential of the individual. This is the point. At the same time, people come up against problems of daily life and start worrying about what is happening to perestroika. Hence the immediate task—to ease the accumulated tension which has already led to inflation in the country's consumer market. Such an opportunity is offered by the 1990 plan; there are also calculations for 1991. We will pursue a very rigid policy here. There may even be isolated cases when unpopular measures will be taken—in order to hold out on the one hand, and on the

other hand to build up, to build up to the utmost the volume of goods. Let me tell you: Whereas our commodity growth until 1988 and even until 1987 was R10-12 billion a year, the growth in 1988 was R24.5 billion, and it reached R35 billion last year. In other words, commodity growth, the increase of commodity volume is three times faster. This growth is planned at almost R66 billion in 1990. In other words, it is necessary to make sure that money is not handed out for nothing and, on the other hand, to reveal our economy's full potential and gear it toward satisfying demand and increasing commodity production. For this purpose we are thoroughly turning the defense sector and other sectors around in this direction.

So what should be given and done in order to ensure that all this yields results more rapidly? Besides everything directly concerns the improvement of the health of the market and financial system, comrades, it is necessary to give people broad opportunity to show initiative. People must be given the opportunity to show their mettle. Without this, just as without the economic reform and without changes in ownership relations and forms of economic management, nothing will work.

Therefore it is necessary to accelerate the reform; the first months of this year will be devoted to this. We will now move more rapidly in this direction, but this will also require more mental effort from everyone. Some people say: We should hand out everything and carry out denationalization. In this connection I recall that when we assembled for the country's Second Congress of People's Deputies and began to discuss the government program, there was disappointment in some quarters in the West, especially in America. They had expected the Congress to decide to denationalize over half of the people's property. That would mean transferring 50-60 percent of state property to private ownership. But such expectations show that our partners, with whom we maintain dialogue and exchange opinions, including on questions of perestroika, have a very poor idea of our society. No, we must breathe new strength into our economy via a diversity of forms of ownership and via new forms of economic management. We will not take the path of reviving the capitalist system. I don't think that the working class and the peasantry would agree to capitalization. We certainly do not rule out individual ownership; we are expanding its bounds and encouraging not only collective farms but working peasant farms, the private sector. In short, more freedom must be offered in economic life, including on the basis of decentralization.

Anyone who thinks that economic autonomy and freedom are bound up solely with the economic autonomy of republics or regions is profoundly mistaken. The key to economic freedom and autonomy and to the development of economically accountable forms, lease and other new forms of economic management, is perestroika of the main link. And the main link of any economy is the enterprise. If we leave everything as it is in the enterprise and merely transfer the functions of the center to the republics, then one stratum of bureaucrats

will merely take the place of another. Is this freedom? Let's think for a minute. That is point one.

Two. Now we have emerged onto the most critical path. There have been rallies, policy has been defined, and now the laws have emerged, the new economic, legal environment in which everything has begun to simmer. Our all-union boiler has begun to whistle because we have begun to deal with the economy and the management system, everything is affecting cadres, the party, the Army; it has affected everyone. This is not easy, comrades. It is not easy to smash every prevailing notion we have had in our minds for years, for decades. This is, I will be blunt, the most difficult thing: getting everything through to people. And it is not proving easy; there are already voices saying: We don't want this, let's go back. There are such voices, and they are not averse to exploiting social tension in markets and stores, taking advantage of people's discontent, and frustrating the process of perestroika. We must realize this.

Furthermore. All this is being done in a vast country where many dozens of peoples are living. I lived for many years close to Dagestan where in every valley people speak a language of their own. Such are our realities. It is important to grasp the dialectic of the interconnections between perestroika and the vision of our near and more distant future, and the entire complex of interethnic relations. Perestroika has made it possible for these problems to surface, for, after all, they are not simple problems. It has mobilized all our peoples and lead them out onto the great road of modern development—this is a fact. At the same time, problems, connected with the repressions of past years, with all kind of campaigns, with the struggle against dissidents, and so forth, have erupted, and behind all this there are the destinies of people, the destinies of peoples. And nonetheless only in this way, only through truthful appraisal, is it possible to get to understand everything that has happened to us, and to draw lessons for the future from it.

The first lesson is political. It is necessary to dismantle the ideology of Stalinism and all that is connected with it, including the administrative-edict system. The second lesson is that we must take the path of the creation of such a structure of our multinational state which will enable us to develop the potential of each people—their intellectual and their cultural potential and their traditions. If in the past we have advocated a "blending of nations," a "blending of languages" and so forth, we know now what the attempt to standardize everything has led to. Such profanation degraded our peoples in general, all the peoples without exception. Therefore we must grasp now that we can progress successfully only if we restructure this policy. It will have the support of all the peoples of our country because we will ignore nothing but, on the contrary, we have embarked on a thorough study of the whole range of interethnic problems.

Why deny it, we have raised many toasts to the friendship of peoples, and said many eloquent words on this subject in various speeches. On the one hand, these words were correct. But on the other hand we failed to say much that should have been said. We pretended that there were no problems, and if there were some, they were not essential. Now we see that there are many problems and they must be tackled, unquestionably, from different positions. In conversation with comrades from your republic and Estonian and Latvian leaders I have said that the main principles can be reduced to a number of propositions. First, we must, without fail, act in such a way as to ensure that all people, irrespective of their nationality, irrespective of where they are living, enjoy full rights. Any discrimination in respect of a minority be it in the country as a whole, a republic, or a region is impermissible. Everyone must be able to feel confident wherever they live, wherever they work, wherever fate has taken them, so to speak.

If we fail to understand how important this is, comrades, we may cause such a lot of damage in the sphere of human relations, we may so poison relations between our people, that subsequently whole generations will try to bring people together again and it will all come to nothing. I am not trying to intimidate you, but it is necessary to look at things realistically. I have realized this especially keenly when we started drafting the provision on language, when we began to transform the electoral system in the light of the political reform. The smallest violation in these matters evokes such a stormy reaction! You will recall how this turned out in Estonia and Moldavia. And Russia and the Ukraine were not passed by either. Suddenly our society was in a state of turmoil. Look what has happened in Uzbekistan, in Fergana, what is happening around Nagorno-Karabakh. How agonizingly difficult it is to guide events back to a normal channel. People were living together, they intermarried—are these families to be split up now? And refugees have appeared in the country, refugees created by intolerance toward people of a different nationality. Let us reflect what will be in store for us if we turn a deaf ear to these lessons, if we do not assimilate them, if everyone is locked in in somekind of stereotype of his own. What will be in store for us?

Let everyone think this through for himself. I do not wish to impose, but let me say outright: I am convinced that if we had followed a different path, if we had not been true to this principle—which, incidentally, the second congress also adopted as a most important premise—troubles would not have been avoided. Either someone would have raised the question that a dividing line or border somewhere had been violated, or that some bit of land or pasture was in the wrong place, or that a century ago or half a century ago things had been such and such. Everything needs redistributing, it is argued. Surely we cannot embark on that path today? After all, there is great truth and wisdom in the fact that 30 years after the war the world inscribed a provision on the inviolability of borders in the Helsinki Act. This is equally important,

comrades, in relations between countries and in relations within a country. The other approach is fraught with unpredictability. Then the questions immediately start pouring in...let him go to Vilnius.... And throughout the country, I repeat, I don't know any skilled person or politician—anyone—who has such a miraculous gift that he can separate people's lives in our country. Such separation is a blind alley.

That is the first principle that I spelled out to the leaders of the Baltic republics at the time. I will not say that they remained deaf or did not understand, nor will I say that they have thought everything right through or analyzed it all in depth. The second principle. We have developed in this country while proclaiming that we are a federation, but in fact, unfortunately, we have developed not as a federation but as a unitary state.

This corresponded to the Stalinist concept, to that dictatorial regime. And the most profound changes occurred in our state in this connection. In demography and in the economy, in the organization of defense, in the construction and creation of supply lines, everything was as in a unified state, which distributed labor within this unified state on the basis, moreover, of the centralized siting of productive forces. And republic and oblast representatives vied with each other to see who could "extract" most capital investments for new plants. And if today somebody tells you that all this is "intriguing" by the center—and one comrade told me here, at the plant, that what we are witnessing in this case is imperial thinking and attempts to distribute and deploy productive forces and Russian influence in order to enslave and squeeze out pillaged peoples—I have to pass on the following information to you.

When this question was put and it became clear that people's ignorance and lack of information was being played on, I told the party Central Committee to invent requests from republics, oblasts, and autonomous republics and regions for the construction of new enterprises. I now have a whole tome of them. What does it say? That a competition was raging, involving recriminations and accusations—you only have to read the transcripts of plenum and session proceedings. Somebody has been given more, somebody has been given less, somebody has been given a plant, but we haven't been given anything. So the center has been "at work" here, and in fact we all worked together! That's a fact. There's more. If we are talking about Lithuania, an interesting, major, difficult figure—Comrade Snehkus—worked here for a very long time. I was personally acquainted with him. We had mutual sympathies, so to speak; I knew the man's stance and know what he did for Lithuania. He transformed this peasant republic into a modern progressive republic which today is comparable with a state in terms of its potential, in every respect. (Applause).

You know how much of the union budget he used to make this land more productive, richer; this land which people once used to quit so as to go off and earn money

by growing grain by the tonne in the Kuban and Stavropol Kray? Does anyone leave Lithuania for that purpose nowadays? On the contrary. They left because they had to. They were leaving during an age some people here would like us to think was a golden age. But we know what kind of a "golden age" it was, when hundreds of thousands of people were forced to quit their homes and become emigres. No, comrades, one must not embellish things. One must not do that. All, we want is the truth, the whole truth—about that period too. Otherwise, the speculation and innuendo will give rise to grievances and feelings which should not be there anyway.

So we need a federation, a federation as the political superstructure of our already established, historically established federal economic foundation. The need for a federation is dictated by our past economic development. We say that the whole of Europe is undergoing integration, headed toward a stronger common market. But the level of cooperation—the comrades from the State Planning Committee will confirm this and your republic's leaders know it—the level of cooperation in our country is in many cases higher than in the European community! Such is the division of labor. It is no accident that the director of your plant tells me that you have links with 200 enterprises, and the workers are still complaining about late deliveries.

We are all dependent on one another. There are certain enterprises in Lithuania that are the only ones of their kind in the country. If today an enterprise stops or is stopped, the whole Union feels it, the whole economy suffers. Is that good or bad? I think it is bad. You get a monopoly, and that is bad too. Or take your neighbor—the famous Riga Minibus Plant, which merely assembles the vehicles, the parts being supplied by hundreds of enterprises. This kind of cooperation, however, agrees with current world trends. Take defense, communications, and ports, which link our vast country to the world. It has also invested funds to create these ports and these communications. What has your republic got from this? I must say, not everything, but a great deal.

True, Comrade Brazauskas, since he knows that I know everything and he knows everything, will immediately say that he gets little from the ports. That is right, not enough comes from the ports. But on the whole you have received more hard currency from the Union than you have provided in terms of goods which earn foreign currency [valyutnyye tovary]. Comrade Brazauskas agrees with this. In fact, when people know everything they discuss things in a practical way. But when some know, while others do not know, speculation occurs.

At the moment no republic can live without the other republic. Indeed, the whole land of Uzbekistan is working for the whole Union. Some 75 percent of the land used to be engaged entirely in producing cotton, to fulfill a Union order. But people also need meat and milk. But they are working for cotton, which we all need. We say to them: You will get milk, meat, and butter from

somewhere else and you will give the country cotton. This is specialization. That is how we are all bound together. The question is: How do we build from now on, when we are talking about autonomy [samostoysatel'nost']? I think that if we tackle things at the level of political definitions and strident slogans we will have nothing but trouble. But if we take a realistic view and see how we can create a realistic policy, we will make progress.

I am certain that the federation cannot be left in this condition, nor the republics left in this position; we should harmonize everything inside the Union to prevent anything from being redrawn or severe trials being created for any people. Even a large republic like Russia will be unable to manage on its own. Although it has already been insinuated to the Russians that there, too, such processes have been gone through. Incidentally, not without encouragement from here. The seditious idea is also been insinuated to the Russians—and with reference to "research studies" by scientists—that if Russia detaches itself from the Union it will within 4 years be the most prosperous state in the world. (Applause). There is no need to applaud; it is better to listen. I do not on the whole want us make a lot of stamping and clapping. I want us to reflect. I came so that we might put our minds together and listen to arguments from each side. And if someone tries to impose his opinion, what kind of pluralism, truth, or respect do we have here? Our federation needs autonomy without fail. We should give the republics sovereignty and delimit the competence of the Union and of the republics on the political plane to the maximum extent.

People here are talking of freedom and independence [nezavisimost'] being given to Lithuania. This, you know, resembles a game. I was talking today at the V.I. Lenin Memorial with a young man called Vergilius. And he spoke of freedom for the Lithuanians. Right, I said, let's start with that. You are free. I am free, all those alongside us are free. But we should live together. How should we begin? By adapting our freedom and interests to one another. By taking things into consideration and giving respect and support. That is how things should be among people; relations cannot be built otherwise. Things do not always prove so simple in a family either. And among peoples? Here we have free Lithuania. But will you cooperate with others or not? Or are you breaking off cooperation? (Voices from hall: "We will!"). You know, all the processes proceed simultaneously and in parallel—economic, political, and cultural. We therefore need to give the opportunity to every people to realize their own potential and fill the federation with new, real content to the maximum extent—that is what needs to be done! The other way will set in motion forces that we do not imagine. So what path is to be followed? The path which will allow it to be given a new character without destroying what is already formed, and fill it with a new content in order that it really be a union of equal sovereign states? Or do we start hacking up the peoples, our destiny, and the economy—and recarve everything? Do we take that path?

Comrades, that is what is suggested by people whose plans went awry many years ago—they have a nostalgia for those times. (Applause). Or their plans have gone awry today and they want to realize their own political ambitions. Notwithstanding this, let us get to the bottom of things and, casting prejudice aside, take everything constructive from them both. Confrontation is not necessary. Let us conduct a dialogue and hold discussion, recognizing equal rights for all. And recognizing that in this land the Lithuanian people should feel that their roots are here and that this is their land. There is no alternative. (Applause). If Lithuanians feel encroached upon, unequal, and degraded it will be bad for everyone. If it is bad for all the others, it will be bad for Lithuanians too. I do assure you that is how it will be. And I perceive that there is already a coolness. If the "frosts" start, this will be followed by a split and confrontation, and nothing good will come of it. It is necessary to improve this life with which we are discontented, but it is necessary to do it together.

I think that I have basically given an answer to all the questions and slogans being put forward. Herein is the key. And all the rest is detail. You may ask: But what about the specifics? There is a lot I do not know myself. Let us think about this together; I have, however, spoken about the main thrust. (Applause)

The third point of my conversation with the leaders of the Baltic republics about which I spoke to you above was as follows: The federation is a complete [napolnennyy] and full-blooded entity and we have sovereign republics and the united CPSU as a powerful integrating political force in conditions of democratization and decentralization, because there are similar equilibratory mechanisms in any organism. Otherwise its destruction is inevitable. The enormous unifying role of the CPSU—but that I want to talk about later at my meeting with the republic party aktiv. For now I will limit myself to what I have already said.

Thank you for your attention. I can see that you have listened really carefully. (Applause).

The following also spoke at the meeting: V. Simonenko, engineer designer; V. Dervoyed, chief of the design bureau of the chief technologist's department; G. Putlyalis, deputy chief technologist; N. Fedoravichene, engineer; I. Barantsevich, toolmaker; V. Gregulevich, S. Krasovskiy, and A. Adamovichus, engineers; and others. The most varied opinions were expressed: Some favored a united USSR, others advocated the separation of Lithuania from the Union. Such a polarity of judgments was also found in the assessment of the decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. At the same time the speakers did in a committed and thorough way pose the problems of speeding up perestroika in the country and the republic and of increasing the level of prosperity of the people.

M.S. Gorbachev's concluding remarks at the discussion will be published in the next issue.

11 Jan Address to Intelligentsia

*LD1201224490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1525 GMT 12 Jan 90*

[Address by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at meeting with representatives of the Lithuanian intelligentsia in Vilnius on 11 January—recorded; video shows Gorbachev in an auditorium addressing the meeting]

[Text] I can understand much of what was said here, both the anxieties and the cares, and the discussion in that connection. However, there was not much of the latter. The majority has already been formed here, and whenever pluralism plods along its difficult way, it is immediately told: Enough, it is all clear to us. It is this "it is all clear to us" that troubles me.

You know what, quite frankly: I have the impression that someone is seeking to impose a professorial scheme on real life and on all the people, disregarding the realities without which there is neither science nor the link between cause and effect, nor the understanding of what depends on what and what the priorities are; and in general, nothing can really be assessed, neither in the past nor in the present, nor can some kind of forecast, even an approximate one, be made.

We felt these schemes especially deeply during Stalin's times. They were invented and imposed on society, and there came the image of the enemy, etc., along all the other lines. And society was forced to fit in with those schemes. And wherever it did not work out many heads rolled, but it was the scheme that mattered. I am afraid that such a scheme has been formed in professorial circles and, moreover, it has now fused with sacred feelings and is largely capitalizing on this and feeding off this. Don't be offended by this. This is a sincere conversation. I will ponder over it with you frankly, because I am going to say something, so to speak, about my own position.

I think that this professorship is capitalizing on a natural, great feeling, the national feeling of man, the feeling of one's homeland, of a small homeland, of soil, of this air, of all this to which you are indebted, to one's mother and to one's land. These juices are in your blood.

This is where lie the strength and uniqueness of this state of ours, which we have underestimated. And this is why many misfortunes have occurred: Namely, people have lived here for centuries, for centuries. Here they have their roots, their graves, and here their ancestors lived. After repeatedly coming together and then separating, they finally settled somehow. Nevertheless, the fact is that this is what we have. And one cannot escape from this anywhere. Unless we recognize this from the very beginning, it will not be possible for any policy in a stage such as ours to achieve any goals. All this is clear. One must reckon with this. But one must not try by any means to make capital out of it. Just as the past can always be assessed only in the context of history, of the

epoch, and of the movements of that period, so today, too, a reliable and scientifically substantiated policy can be found only if it takes into account the present realities. But if it has just picked up people's natural desires and wants to base on their wishes its own scheme, as a banner, as it were, saying the people support it, to impose another scheme and force us into the procrustean bed, this will incur yet another misfortune, I think, another misfortune.

I am just starting to reflect on this. Do not be in a hurry to let your hearts get carried away. Follow my line of thought. There is a need to think this out. The rallies are over, and emotions must be left to writers and to the theater of Comrade Banionis to prevent it from losing prestige. All this is necessary. Emotions should remain there. For man progresses due to his emotions, so to speak.

Nevertheless, here in this circle, when the fate of the country and of the people is discussed, it is necessary to see all the mutual links, and it is necessary to see all realities. This is when metaphysics ends. Metaphysics! The most horrible thing about it is schemes. We drove people into kolkhozes. We drove them into all sorts of places. I can list them. You know all this very well, since the competence of this audience is clear to me. And this releases me from this routine work, as they say.

In order, from the start, to make my credo clear to you, it has, to a considerable degree, determined and determines our present policy which we are elaborating and which we have proposed to the people and which has, in the main, received support everywhere. I wish to say that my credo lies in the fact that the country cannot live any longer in the way it used to live. It must undergo renewal.

It must be renewed in all its organically linked parts and structures. This means the base, the superstructure, the spiritual world, the federation—I do not want to go into detail now—everything must be renewed, including the Army—I am looking around for the poetess, the woman writer [who spoke on the subject earlier]—including the Army, and you will hear this in our keynote document on this score, so to speak, in our draft. Everything must be renewed.

This is my credo. Why? Because using the old approaches, using deformed structures, using the Stalinist concept of a totalitarian state, using a system that compressed the entire body and deprived it of oxygen and movement, without which nothing can happen, we shall solve nothing, nothing. So we have to seek the answers not by going back, although we have to look at the past, nevertheless, to try and learn from history, despite Hegel's prophetic words, and make fewer mistakes. Still, we have to seek answers to all the problems that have arisen on the path of renewal, and we do have a principled starting position on this score: to tap the potential of this society, a democratic and humane society, and impart a character to it. We know that Lenin envisaged this society as a living creativity of

the people, as a system of the working people. It can neither be born nor exist without democracy. In such an event the system is either deformed or perishes, and that is what you and I have lived through.

The revival of the Leninist concept of socialism is therefore connected with democratization and glasnost permeating the whole of society and every sphere of life in it.

For me this is a choice as a person, as a politician and as a Communist. And it is something I cannot now be separated from. So in this respect everything is clear. Many questions are arising. After all, we began with the simple things, as I was saying today. But we have to get back to that. I said earlier to one of the audiences that we began with the simple things, knowing that life in the country was hard in the social and economic respects. And our first policy steps were at the level of rapid reaction, as it were, to that situation. And then the idea of socioeconomic acceleration appeared, on the basis of scientific and technical progress, in order to push the pace of labor productivity, hence the national machine-building program and so on. We had the program, the resources were allocated, we were exerting ourselves, but nothing was happening. We realized that the system, the economic structures were impeding scientific and technical progress, which meant that there had to be a reform of the economy, of property relations, for people had been distanced, alienated from the means of production. They had to be reinserted in that process through a fundamental and radical perestroika.

That was the next step, a difficult one, yet we still hadn't understood everything. Then we saw that we couldn't achieve anything in the economy there, either, unless we were to strike a blow mainly against the command system, against all the structures on which the whole of society stood, against all facets of the apparatus. And it was in this same context that the problem of reinterpreting the party's role confronted us. That's what gave rise to the political reform which has unfolded these processes and set the whole of society in motion.

We have now awakened and evoked colossal forces. It is certainly necessary to give them a constructive orientation. We must definitely show care in this respect, because besides everything else an atmosphere has been created that is being exploited from the right, from the left, and from whichever direction you like.

The whole of our society has indeed started moving on this entire scale. Naturally, of course, we have reached a point where we shall accomplish nothing in our multinational state unless we concern ourselves with the federation, the position of the people and their destiny, and unless we give meaning to this whole phenomenon.

What then is this phenomenon? It is a vast multinational state and hundreds of peoples, cultures, and languages. Moreover, many of them now find themselves in a

difficult situation. Nothing will be achieved. I am convinced that this is all correct and is all logically connected. Everything has stemmed from life and has been reflected in our policies. This is why we racked our brains so long over this concept which has been reflected in our platform.

I am aware that among you it has not evoked everyone's enthusiasm. In this connection, since it is the central point of all the discussion on Lithuanian soil and it is also directly connected with the 20th Communist Party of Lithuania Congress and all intermixed with the union as a whole, it is obviously, dear friends, worthwhile to dwell in more detail on it. Let me say straight away that from my viewpoint, politically, I consider it not only necessary to emphasize the provision in the old Constitution and all the constitutions that our union republics have the right to self-determination but also to preserve it in the Constitution. This is of fundamental importance.

You know, I have been listening to you, and it seems to me that you are fighting windmills to some extent. You are fighting against the past, about which I have been speaking and which I do not accept as you and the party and the people now do not accept. We are moving away from this past. We are all moving away. We are breaking away with difficulty. Perhaps some people do not even want to do so at all. Nevertheless, the country's choice is to move away from this past on to the broad path of development, dynamic development and rebirth of the people and of the country. In your arguments you are dealing all the time with the past. We have already assessed the situation and we are organizing the path to follow, while you are still fighting against this past. Certain people, however, have already begun to fight against perestroika, too, and that is dangerous. And they already want to come to the conclusion that perestroika will not provide the answers to questions which life has posed, including in the sphere of interethnic relations, in the nationalities sphere. And for that reason all this emerges, as an argument, and very... [changes thought] the arguments, by the way, there is emotion, but little argument in what you are saying today. Do not be offended; do not be offended; that is how it is. That is how it is.

I think that I have to answer one question for you quite frankly: How and why I came to the conclusion, with conviction—and by the way, this also determined the fact, it is not just me—that we three times postponed the plenum on the nationalities issue and held it a year afterwards, because all the time we wanted to understand what had happened to our country, to our state. And why, all the same, do we, and I personally, advocate a renewal of federation and oppose separatism? I would like to tell you about this. The fact is that such an approach is interpreted by some as a continuation of imperial thinking. I am constitutionally unsuited to this, and I think that your familiarity with me, with my style of thinking, of actions, and of adherence to the processes

of renewal, gives grounds to hope for understanding of this, that you are in agreement with such a thing. It is unacceptable for me.

The processes which are presently taking place in society, as it happens, confirm what I am saying. There is no question here of any imperial thinking, imperial policy, of any imperial thinking, no.

In reality such an approach to the future of the federation is deeply motivated. You know, such a paradox results from it: We spoke, proclaimed, and recorded the federation in the Constitution, but in reality we developed as a unitary state. And moreover, that unitarianism was of a high degree, leaving an imprint on the whole of the Soviet Union, on all processes, comrades, in the economy as well as in politics and culture, etc. And that was a misfortune, a great misfortune. It resulted in big losses. But realities appeared as a result of the development of the processes in the unitary state. You can analyze this against the example of your own Republic and you will see that our division of labor is such that there is nothing like it in the world.

Well, Comrade Karimov was going around here as a representative of Uzbekistan. A total of 75% of more than 4 million hectares of irrigated land is used to produce cotton for the country. And it is there where they have two to three crops and 12 hay harvests of alfalfa, and 170 quintals of hay are yielded per hectare, where everything grows and corn produces yields of 100 quintals. That's how we planned, and that's where the trouble started. Now these people are not supplied with meat, and we take away oil-seed meal. We take away cotton, and we take away in excess of 1 million tonnes of oil-seed meal to balance the kitty, including Lithuania's as well. But that is the reality. I will be enumerating all those things to you because when we start thinking about what to do further and what things to implement, one should see it all.

Well, I would like to begin with the fact that as a result of the known distribution of the productive forces in the country very serious demographic processes sprang up, and in many places they turned out to be distortions and caused tension in interethnic relations. That is so. Some say this is the center's fault. No, it is not only the center's fault. And, on the whole, when the union is mentioned, you are all in this union. What is the union? Is it something mythical outside the republics? The union had one form, and now we want to make it different; but all this is of our own making. So when it became difficult for me to fight against the comrades and arguments were running out, I asked to sum up for the last 15 or 20 years—I do not remember exactly—and I was given a volume of applications for all the republics and the country's major regions on developing the productive forces, on distribution. All three Baltic republics were among the most active applicants, and Smolensk, where there are hardly any people left in the villages. And nevertheless, there is an aircraft works, other works, branches of the Zil, and so on. The land has been drained

of blood. They competed among themselves. There were resentments. Just read the speeches—you have them—that were made at sessions in those years and you will see in the speeches made by your chairmen of the state planning committees and chairmen of the councils of ministers that they were critical of the fact that someone was given something, works were sited and tied in [privyazat] while capital investments were not provided here and works were not tied in.

Why am I saying this? Not to look for a scapegoat, no. I want to say the following: Realities have taken place, and as a result of such an approach to the distribution of the production forces it has come about that now 60 million people in the Soviet Union reside outside their national territories. All this is so serious that the slightest error in this matter—I am looking at my old friend, Comrade Oleynik, a poet and a writer, one of the leaders of the Writers' Union of the Ukraine. He is a rapporteur on the language problem at the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. Is it so, Comrade Oleynik? And we have spoken on this subject more than once. What complexities have suddenly arisen and how difficult it was to contain the situation within a correct understanding, to harmonize all that! And at the first stage things took such a turn that on the basis of that language problem alone something emerged, and things were set in motion and the Crimea, Donbass, Kharkov, all the Ukraine was set in motion.

Well, so what, it seems. It was called Kievan Rus; the roots of the Slavs are there, and three peoples, as it were, have grown from those roots—their tree. And, nevertheless, even there, it went as far as calls to collect signatures: We are leaving and returning to Russia, and so on. Well, all that was dampened through harmonization, and so on. But I am saying how important it is, comrades, because people throughout the country—take Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan—Karimov is said to have spoken here about that. This is yet another reality which cannot be ignored when one ponders over the future and the development of our federation. Take coproduction. You new deputy chairperson, Comrade Prunskene Kazimira Pranovna, will tell you that our level of coproduction compares favorably with that of the Common Market. It reaches up to 40%, and even more, even more. There are enterprises here in Lithuania and there are enterprises in Armenia and wherever which are the only ones of their kind. Comrade Brazauskas told me today that a factory had been shut down in Yerevan for ecological reasons, the Nairit factory. And this affects the whole country because it is the only one of its kind. Here you have three or five enterprises; enterprise—to what a level monopolism has been raised!

If they drop out, stop; it affects the whole country. But on the other hand, today we visited the fuel equipment works. The workers complain of deliveries, forgings being held up, and so on. It seems that the accessories or initial materials for production come from 250 enterprises. That's the situation. That's the living mutual connection. And at once people suffer. The workers say plainly: Everyone is holding meetings and meetings, and

you are encouraging this, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you too, as it were, while we, the labor collective, stands... [changes thought] In the end, everything is held together by the economy, and by social processes, and so on—people's lives, what people are agitated about now. That's where the mutual connections are, you understand?

Or take cultural exchanges and scientific exchanges. Comrade Maslyukov and Comrade Velikhov and Comrade Kolesnikov were at the Sigma. Were you there yesterday? Yesterday, they saw that on the one hand it is a progressive enterprise, and a very promising one, while on the other hand it does not have enough science to attain the level of modern requirements and enter extensively both into the domestic market and the international market. Yet it has the potential. Without cooperation and pooling of scientific resources this won't be achieved. It won't be achieved. On the contrary, it will be achieved if that does exist. So that is another reality. And are we not rich today in that we can read Mezhlayskis and Oleynik in all languages? And who would know Rutkheo, who represents a northern people, and his sagas about that people and that nature? How could they have heard of him? These are realities, these are all exchanges, you understand, which have become an integral part of our life. I'm only touching on various aspects to show what has happened to us as a result of that life that has been lived. You are trying to cite to me arguments and quotations, utterances and so on. That is all. I accept that from you. But there is real life, national life. There is no life, you see, there is no life. [as heard] So I'll put it this way: There are realities, realities. Even if that is so, even if that is so, yes, if one enterprise is ready to dictate to the whole union, whether all the enterprises are to work or not to work, that is terrible. And there are also things about which we today simply... [changes thought] I'm only saying, only touching on some of the aspects.

I know what you have in mind. Transport links in this state have been created reckoning on just such an approach. To implement foreign economic links such approaches have been created. This giant has to have this to pump the blood through its veins; it has to have contact with the world. All this exists, you cannot do anything about it. You can be enraged that this has poisoned the sea, that it has ruined things, yes, but it all exists.

Look at the market of the union. I have all the figures here. I don't want to quote them, about what colossal exchange there is between republics, what transfusions there are. The internal and external borders of the USSR, defense, the disposition of armed forces. There you see what is involved and everything that comes up like a living thing when we start reflecting. How are we to act? How are we to act to find the most correct way out of the most awful realities—and I am joining in with you here—that we would like to leave behind, and make our federation, our multiethnic state, more noble? There are two paths.

The first path is secession from the Soviet Union, the breaking of these ties, and so on. [voices from hall] No, no, just a minute. Secession from the Soviet Union, breaking of federal ties. [more voices from hall] So, it's yes to secession from the Soviet Union. Yes? Yes or no? [loud "yes" from hall] Secession? [replies of "yes" from hall] There you are, then. I am asking so that the whole of the Soviet Union can be informed, and so that all should now reflect about their Lithuanian brothers and what they have thought up. [voice from hall mentioning "threat"] What threat? Have you considered it, what I am saying? [voice from hall: "It is not just the Lithuanians"] Just a minute, not only them, let everybody reflect. This is the first path.

And the second path—then we begin to sort out who has to live where, who has to go where. [voices from hall] Well, don't you simplify things!

As yet nothing has been done, not a step has been taken, toward secession, but already what letters there are, what worries, and what troubles and uncertainty about the future have come up for so many people. [indistinct voices from hall] Justified or not, they do exist. They exist. That, too, is a reality. It, too, is a reality.

There is another path. And, after much reflection, that is my conclusion and my profound conviction. We must take the path toward political sovereignty, economic independence, cultural development, toward preservation and development of all traditions, language and so on, via the augmentation of the current development, so that it really corresponds to what is written in the Constitution: sovereign states united in a federation, a federation. Do you know what a federation is, or not? [replies of "yes, we know" from hall] How do you know? You have not lived in one. You have not lived in one, and so you cannot put the argument to me that you know about federation. [more murmurs from hall] A federation. And they said the Lithuanians were restrained, self-possessed. [laughter and indistinct voice from hall] It turns out that everything quickly disappears altogether when there is pluralism of opinions. Just one objects, and already... no, hear me out, whether you want to or not. Hear me out. Hear me out. That is what we came here for. We will talk.

Do not think that we are enemies, you and us, no, no. And do not think that in the persons of those comrades who have come here and represent the Central Committee, Russia, various republics, Moscow or not Moscow—no, these are all worried people, like you, and their worry is how we can advance, but all together, together. Retreat into isolation is an illusory, although enticing, dream, but if this secession is to be done it will come; and, therefore, I think, I am for self-determination up to separation, and in relation with this an instruction has been given to develop a draft law on the mechanism for implementing this right by any republic which decides to leave the Soviet Union. The first draft of this kind has

already appeared, it has appeared, and it will be submitted for a union-wide discussion and for a referendum. Because what exists today in this or that republic—our union has been secured in the Constitution and the things that take place in it relate to all the peoples.

Our union is pinned together by the Constitution, and what happens in it concerns all the peoples. If anyone has the simplified notion that today or tomorrow elections could have been held and you could have gotten together, put your hands up, and left the Soviet Union, then this is not politics; it does not even come near the scent of politics; it is simply, in general, something silly, because you will have to have dealings with all the republics, with the state, and tackle all the issues. What about the people who will want to leave if you secede? And who is supposed to create the housing and the jobs for those who are left here? And what principles will we build our relations upon? And so forth and so on. Much emerges here. It is a process, and a very profound and serious one. But what I favor is that there should be a certain mechanism. All kinds of speculation—when there is a constitutional right, but the mechanism has not been worked out—should be stopped. We must work it out, work it out, and let the people make their choice. The people are offered everything, they will show what everything is all about, you understand. [applause] And let the people make the choice. The people will make sense of things. For the present, the people do not know what awaits them. They are being fed fairy tales. There are Russian fairy tales, Lithuanian fairy tales—they have existed in past centuries, and they are still emerging right now. But our people, both the workers and the peasants throughout the country, the union, and here, must know what is what, and let them decide. Let them decide because many people want to capitalize on this natural desire for independence, for sovereignty. A natural desire, and we must resolve it. Nothing will come of perestroika if we do not resolve it.

But I am in favor of a solution within the framework of a federation, because otherwise we will run up against such a heightening of human relations—and of all other relations, but chiefly human ones—that this will put the whole union back, every people, and will turn out to involve great losses. And so it is better to go down this path. I believe that this is possible. And we have made a move on this. I think that in the course of this year we shall move far in this direction, a long way, because in the Supreme Soviet we must tackle the issues of land and property, and find solutions, and the next thing for us, Comrade Vilkas, is a law on the division of the competences of union and delineation of union and republican bodies, where it will be written that this is a republic, and nobody will interfere there any more. Nobody. No giving of commands, that is a republic. And then there is the union, as agreed by the republics, and with what they have transferred to the union. And here, too, this will be the federal level, and nobody will be able to encroach on it. That is clear.

At the moment, you know what we have?

It happens both ways: The republic can undermine the Supreme [Soviet] law, and the Supreme [Soviet] is trying to go into such detail, into which it does not have to go. The center tries to interfere in the affairs of the village soviet! Is it possible to govern a state in this way? No, I think we will be moving in this direction very strongly, very strongly. We must not destroy. We must not call things into doubt or sow suspicions among other peoples. Look at the way the whole country has become anxious! Why is this? Everything is being unravelled by perestroika. You see, we are implementing this process of democratization toward sovereignty, and toward various other things. So, what do the Lithuanians need? So, I begin to say: It cannot be the people who are involved in this. You see, the people cannot be in favor of this, in favor of this path. Perhaps, it... [changes thought] but the reply I get is no, no, no. But, comrades, the people must sort this out for themselves. The people have yet to sort this out [indistinct shouting from the audience] when we tell them everything about what they are to go through and what awaits them. Then they will have to think.

Therefore, I am in favor of the second option. And this is my conviction. You must know it. Just as I must know the way you think, you, too, have to know with whom you are dealing. Why? Because this is, for example, what I heard recently. This is what I was told: The Sajudis Sejm is in progress, and the following speech was heard: We must say that we support Gorbachev's line while implementing our own policy. [Indistinct shouts from the audience; unidentified person says: "This is not true. I am a Sejm member and there was nothing like this." Someone else says: "I can say, too, that this did not happen."]

All right, I am pleased that you are refuting this. If you give the future of the republic to the hands of such two-faced politicians, hard trials are in store for you. These are the people who put their own ambitions, their own bankrupt careerist ways, and their nostalgia for the past above all else. This must be sorted out. This is why I favor a federation and giving substance to your rights, but definitely in a way whereby independence and sovereignty are achieved within the federation.

And then I ask: What else do you want?

Virgil, a young lad, replied to me: Freedom, Mikhail Sergeyevich, freedom. All right. Is this correct? [shouts from the audience of "correct"] All right. Do you want to be free, Comrade Prunskene, do you wish to be free? [reply heard: "Yes."] Me, too. But suppose we meet and we live together as part of the same collective. Must we reckon with one another? [shout from the hall: "Of course."] Do we have to restrict our freedom? Yes, we have to restrict it. Of course, we do. How otherwise can we coexist? How can it be otherwise? [indistinct voices from hall] Hang on a minute, hang on a minute, Comrade Vilkas. Do not beat around the bush. Let us talk frankly. All right, if we live in the same city, should we harmonize the interests of teachers, medics, workers,

etc.—of everyone? Should we harmonize them? So must we give up some of our own freedom in order thereby to create equilibrium?

Some time ago Mrs Thatcher and I had a talk. It was initially very heated when we clarified our positions and made approaches toward the understanding of major concepts at the crucial stage of finding ourselves all being civilized. At the time I reminded her of Palmerston's famous words—and you can check that this is right. He said that England had neither perpetual enemies nor eternal friends. Instead there are eternal interests. I said: I agree with what your countryman said. I hope you do, too.

[Unidentified voice] Yes, I agree.

[Gorbachev] But do you agree that Britain has its interests?

[Unidentified voice] Yes.

The Soviet Union also has its interests. Moreover, 300 million of them—just imagine it. Those are sound interests indeed! But even Ethiopia has interests. And Cambodia. And Panama has interests. So what is to be done? [indistinct voices in hall] So what is to be done? I still believe that you are in the USSR, and that you do not reject it, and, moreover, you deny that you intend to leave the union. So why are you here? Just a moment, I'm getting to our point. I just started with Palmerston so as to get round to Lithuania later.

How should we act in this world, where we make use of common nature, resources, seas, oceans, and where we are coming together? There is no other way than to recognize the right of each people to its interests and to its choice, to maintain harmony and to try to find a balance of interests. In this way it must be sought in the collective and even in the family, comrades. In the union, in Lithuania, it must be sought everywhere, and, therefore, freedom, a free Lithuania and an independent Lithuania—that is, at the same time, a Lithuania that is incorporated in one community or another. Do you really believe you were more independent when there was 57 percent of the capital here during those 20 years? Did you feel very independent? That was the Lithuanian paradise which the Lithuanians left. Why did they leave paradise? Independent Lithuania? [shouting in hall] Comrade Vilkas, I am aware of your penchant for polemics, but you know what I am capable of. We understand one another. It's not that I want... [changes thought] I am just considering matters together with you, comrades. You could embark on this difficult path—smash, destroy, and then the whole country will join in. We'll start dividing it up, setting boundaries. Perhaps there'll be more borders here. Perhaps something else will be remembered that was lost, and we'll start reminding one another.

There's a great deal that could be recalled here. Well then, all this—this is a policy with prospects, is it not, alone turned to the future? No? A policy with prospects

means making use of all the positive elements and getting rid of what has poisoned our soul and even left its mark on our relations, moving forward together, finding and offering a chance to develop. I can still remember not long ago—not only after the war but in the sixties too—when the Belorussians came, Comrade Grigoryev, when people came from Lithuania to earn grain so that there would be bread to eat and, in spite of the regulations that existed, we would give every family a container so that they could send in their grain and, so to speak, make bread here out of that wheat. But look at Lithuania today! Is it as it should be? A good republic? In any case, if the human, economic, and political distortions were gotten rid of, there is great potential here, but it is put together in such a way that it can come into its own only in cooperation with other peoples. That's the point. It should not then be a case of severing economic, political, spiritual, or cultural links, but of enriching them with new content.

I am convinced that nothing will come of restructuring in Lithuania unless the Lithuanian people feel they are the masters of their own land, unless they feel their roots are here and that they face today and tomorrow with confidence. But they will—and this should be everyone's conclusion, that of those who live here who are not Lithuanians and of those in Moscow and beyond—the Lithuanian people will never feel that they are free if their prosperity is based on the humiliation of and refusal to recognize the rights and equality of other peoples. This is the dialectic. There's no getting away from it. No getting away. You are a civilized people. Savages could, perhaps, or killers. You can not. In the end your conscience will not let you. You won't get away. Conscience won't let you in the end. This, comrades... so let us solve this, let us find...[changes thought] And therefore, it is in this connection, that I view the role of the CPSU. If we are going... [changes thought] Why have we all been so worried by the decisions of the 20th Congress? Why did we also meet with the comrades on the evening, both in the Politburo—and I wrote a letter? I'll tell you. We have indeed, really, embarked on the path of reviving the federation. And we're on the path of democratization, decentralization, both of political power and of the economy. To say nothing of culture. In general, these are all things the republic must resolve for itself. And languages and so on, taking into account, of course, the needs of all nationalities. If we do all this, we will have awakened colossal centrifugal forces. But any organism has mechanisms and countermechanisms, and so on. A system always includes these various mechanisms. Any system, where the professors, so to speak, with whom we were recently talking at the Central Committee, who are in the bureau. They'd agree. And any scientist will think—the systemic approach. So in this system, when we move the centrifugal forces, on the paths of democratization and decentralization, in all processes we need the party as the consolidating, as the balancing, unifying element; because these are, after all, parts, but there is the organic whole, and that is unity on the plane where we coordinate our positions in the

macro—on the macro-level—which are in the interests of the whole union, which the union itself has recognized, its founders, as it were. That is why we favor a united CPSU, comrades, a united CPSU. Or will we be working out, for the union, an outlook, and discussing program documents, while Comrade Brazauskas and his leadership will be sitting in Vilnius and reading the papers, getting it from the papers? And he won't get his viewpoint as far as the Central Committee? Isn't he part of the party, of the CPSU? [murmurs from hall] Well, no, he's withdrawn! [indistinct shouts] What do you mean, invite? Let him sit there on the visitors' platform, you know, where we invite nonmembers of the Central Committee. But think, comrades! What are you? Schema, because of some schema, you're saying this is what life demands. [indistinct comments from hall] No, you are in favor of the Communist Party of Lithuania as an integral organic part, participating in the policy-making process. For that, I don't think you have gone so far as to draw such inferences.

And then the question arises of how to break away from the CPSU. [Indistinct shout from hall] No, you are the ones who are simplifying things! You are simplifying things! If I may be so bold as to point out, you are simplifying things. All this is very serious.

And now what sort of party should the CPSU be? How, and to what extent, should the republic be independent and what should the position of the Communist Party be? Yes, indeed, this is a question that must be resolved, just as the question of the political and economic sovereignty of the republic must be. Moreover, I believe that in the new conditions the communist parties of the union republics should definitely be represented in the main leadership—in the Central Committee, or in the Presidium, or the government, or the Politburo, or what have you. In other words, that independence should extend to everything: from a presence in the topmost leadership and link of the party to independence in tackling structural, financial, and publishing issues; in issues on whether or not to have a nomenclature, how many departments to have, and so on. All of this should be handed over to the Communist Party. And I believe that must be reflected in the new rules. In that way do we opt for the independence of the CPSU—of communist parties within the framework of the CPSU. And then I would ask: What is it you want? [indistinct shouts from hall]

Please, by all means have that. That does not contravene anything. But that does not mean that you must reject the program of the CPSU. [more shouts from hall] Dear friends, we are with you. We are living in a period of perestroika. We are drawing up documents: a programmatic document is in preparation; a new set of rules is in preparation. Everything will be presented at the congress.

If you have thought everything through, then put it forward at the congress. But no, already it turns out you have had enough. It is no longer of any interest to you.

No, comrades! Do take part; we invite you. I told Comrade Brazauskas, both at the plenum and in private: There's a lot of what you've conceived that is very interesting and that coincides, for instance, with my own notions. Put them forward at the congress. [voice from hall: "They tried at the congress"] Oh come on! Tried, indeed! There's no need to make a drama out of it, as though you were poor and downtrodden or something! Incidentally, you are already living according to the norms that we have not yet approved. And nobody's getting in the way of your independence. What, would you deny that? Just try it! You can't! So, that must be enshrined, but this independence must be enshrined within the framework of the CPSU so that you might make yourselves felt there and influence both the policies and the leadership, and so on. And that is only right. But as it is, you have settled yourselves in the Lithuanian corner and are just sitting there, waiting for an invitation.

Yesterday, one of the speakers at the meeting said: We are waiting for Gorbachev as the leader of a friendly country. That is what we have come to! And this is one of the highest philosophical and political achievements! [laughter in the hall] All this is coquetry, but I will tell you, it is not harmless and not safe. One must not play political games with such issues when it is a question of the fate of peoples. One must not. Therefore, dear friends, let us think. I think one should find answers within the framework of cooperation and interaction. We will find them; we will find them. Therefore, think, so that when we meet at the end of my stay those who will take part in the plenum can suggest something. Otherwise, what other way out could there be? Think. I was very glad to meet you, and I hope it is not only I who have heard you, but that you have heard me, too. So think once more. Thank you. [applause] Well, you have, however, applauded twice.

[Unidentified questioner] A very important question, at least for me personally, you know me. [Indistinct quip by Gorbachev: laughter] In your personal opinion: In Western Europe, they are heading for a union; it's hard to say now. They don't call themselves a federation. Well, we say that we also have a union. So what is your personal opinion of the future of our union, compared with the union that is being created by the countries of Western Europe?

[Gorbachev] You know, here's what I'll say to you about that. In general, I haven't touched on that theme. In general, we're all drawn into the world process, and it's in that context that we must see and understand ourselves. [indistinct comment from hall] And, therefore, we shall change. We shall change in the alliance. We shall change in Europe. No one and nothing will wreck this. There may be failures, diseases, declines, but we shall change. There is nothing else, comrades. The other path is a dead end. We must cooperate in a human manner, in politics. We must dispose of the resources, the residue of water, oxygen, and so on. That is an imperative that no one can escape.

Therefore, since that is so, in Europe, in the EEC, after economic factors and structures there arise supranational political structures. And today Mr Mitterrand has raised the question of a confederation. And he is already talking not just of Western Europe, but also of Europe, of Europe. He says, I don't say it will happen tomorrow or in 10 years; I just want to define the trend. And from the viewpoint of the trend, I agree. We shall seek and find. And so, in the context of these changes, we shall be different too. And I am sure that everything depends on how we read our federation and what content we give it. I am confident that, with the federation, by virtue of the variety of our republics, the forms of contacts and distribution of powers and so on may also be various. But these are all things that must be learned and discovered, comrades. That is what we must seek.

There I am at your service. In the other respect, no. Today I am your friend. If you take another road, I'll use everything to show that you are pushing your own people into an historical impasse. Together, we shall strive together.

[Pozhela] Thank you. [applause]

[Gorbachev] Esteemed President, I have very great respect for my old acquaintance, Comrade Pozhela, the president. Thank you.

[Pozhela] I thank you. [applause] Thank you very much for your speech. And there I think we'll end our meeting. Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] We'll have more meetings.

[Pozhela] Mikhail Sergeyevich.

[Gorbachev] All the best. [applause]

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Holds News Conference

Party 'Destiny' Viewed

LD1201183990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1730 GMT 12 Jan 90

[Text] [Announcer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with the secretaries and members of the Bureau of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform, this morning. There was a conversation on the ways for consolidation and on the destiny of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Since a great many journalists were not invited to this meeting, I will refer to some of the views put forward at the press conference by the secretaries of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee.

The composition of the leading bodies of the Provisional Central Committee would not lead anyone to think that the split in the Lithuanian Communist Party had occurred along nationality lines. According to Mikolas Burokevicius, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee, the program of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania is not

communist but a social-democratic one. This is one of the reasons for the split. Some members of the Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee also gave assurances that it was not personal ambition or some kind of aspiration to become once again leading workers of the apparatus that led to the split. It was rather the firm conviction of communists to be within the ranks of a single CPSU.

Professor Yuozas Yermolavicius, member of the Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee and doctor of historical sciences, believes that the conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was a conversation between people of like mind. History is like that, that is why it has happened, he said. But he does believe that the split is a definitive one and that there is scarcely any chance of putting the situation aright. He also believes that political struggle is better than a special situation.

'Future Activities' of Party Members

LD1301041490 Vilnius in English to North America
2300 GMT 12 Jan 90

[Text] Today in the afternoon a news conference was given to foreign, Soviet, and Lithuanian journalists by the loyalist wing of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP], who have decided to remain a constituent part of the Soviet Communist Party.

We hope to find support in the work collectives, whereas our political line will correspond to the ideals of Soviet people. This is how (Aleksandra Smerkulis), a lecturer at the party school, characterized the future activities of those party members who did not want to join forces with the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. The long-hackneyed phrases such as work collectives and ideals of Soviet people left little space for such a concept as the individual. It seems very likely that the set of old and discredited dogmas remains the guiding star of pro-Moscow communists in Lithuania.

Journalists did not get a concrete answer to the question what Mikhail Gorbachev himself thought about the political situation in Lithuania and at whose personal initiative, according to the acting secretary (Juozas Kolalis), the second meeting between the loyalists and the general secretary took place early this morning. Wanting to put a full stop to various speculations spread among journalists who were not invited to the meeting, (Kolalis) said it was a discussion on topical issues between like-minded people. Yet very little information has filtered through about the loyalists' first meeting with the Kremlin leadership earlier in Moscow. Professor (Juozas Germalavicius) outlined the most crucial issues, stating that the political situation in Lithuania had gone out of control and that the republic was threatened by pending disaster. In his opinion, a deep crisis in Lithuania emerged as a result of the doings of certain political forces who were interested in diverting the Lithuanian society's developments from the correct course.

The largest number of questions were put to Vladislav Sved, a party secretary of one of the districts in Vilnius, who noted that at present there were two communist parties in Lithuania and it was impossible not to acknowledge this fact. Moreover, Sved, who is known as one of the most influential members of the loyalists, stated that he was favorably disposed to Lithuania's possible secession from the Soviet Union if the Lithuanian nation is determined to do so, on the condition that this be done by lawful means. Vladislav Sved probably had in mind the bill on secession which, as Mikhail Gorbachev said yesterday, was in the process of making.

Anyhow, so far it's impossible to speak about any compromise between the independent Lithuanian Communist Party and the alternative party, which has decided to remain a constituent part of the Soviet Communist Party. Prof (Juozas Germalavicius) said in conclusion. He became known to the Lithuanian public after publishing an article several years ago which praised Stalinist socialism in postwar years.

13 Jan Meeting of Lithuanian Communist Aktiv

Brazauskas Opening Remarks

PM1601092390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jan 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report on opening remarks by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, at 13 January Lithuanian party aktiv meeting in Vilnius]

[Text] The meeting was opened by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. This is the third day, he said, that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has been in our republic. As is known, in accordance with a decision of the CPSU Central Committee December (1989) Plenum, a group of participants in that plenum has also come to Lithuania. They have met with Communists in many collectives. Mikhail Sergeyevich has worked actively for 3 days together with V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of the newspaper PRAVDA; and other comrades who have participated in tours of our republic.

You might say that today's is the concluding meeting. We have invited to it members of the Central Committee and the Appeal and Finance Commissions of the Lithuanian Communist Party, members of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform) and its Auditing Commission, a group of senior officials of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, leaders of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers and of ministries and departments, representatives of the military, and journalists.

All the seats are filled, and the invited comrades have arrived. We can begin the session of our republic party aktiv.

It is proposed that certain comrades speak and that all formulate their thoughts in a clear, intelligible, and, most importantly, well-reasoned manner. There is not very much time. Because Mikhail Sergeyevich intends to fly to Moscow today. If we could work in an organized manner, we could do a great deal at this session.

Text of Gorbachev Speech

PM1501164990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jan 90 Second Edition pp 1,2

["Mutual Interest, Mutual Responsibility: M.S. Gorbachev's Speech at 13 January Meeting of Lithuanian Party Aktiv"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] My 2 days here and my participation in this meeting, at which the wings of the communist movement in Lithuania are present, show that you have not yet emerged from the state of euphoria and as yet it is difficult to guide the deep process of interpretation into the channel of a general understanding of what is happening among you. That is the first thing. And yet it is necessary, all the same, to hold a discussion. We have no time to lose.

This trip of mine transcends the framework of regular trips, it is of an unusual nature. Let me say at once that, bearing in mind that present here, simultaneously with me is a whole group of comrades from the party Central Committee, and representatives of other republics, and cultural figures, this merely emphasizes what I have said. Our visit here, and the discussion we are having here, reflect the deep anxiety that has arisen in the party, in its various detachments, and in effect, throughout the country, over the way the sociopolitical situation in Lithuania is developing and over the decisions taken by the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. This step has been directed toward finding a way out of the situation which has arisen, on a basis of broad dialogue with the working people, communists, and public of the republic and of a deeper understanding of the mood of the communists and working people of Lithuania, with the aim—the main aim—of averting a dangerous development of centrifugal forces both in the CPSU and in the Soviet Union itself.

What is happening in the world, in the world of socialism, I have to say that the central point of all these changes which promise the attainment by the whole of human civilization of a new stage via the turning point we are passing through, the central point of all this is the Soviet Union, perestroika in the Soviet Union. How it will go, what point it will reach, and what it will lead to, will determine what the world will be like. And if you think I'm falling into exaggeration, then this is not just my point of view. It is a viewpoint which has already taken shape. So enormous responsibility rests on us. I don't separate you from the rest of the country, or from

the CPSU, or from myself. All the discussions, however acute the character they may have assumed here in these days, have merely underlined, and indicated, the correctness of this observation.

Comrades, I think that the Lithuanian Communists and the working people of Lithuania must not get sidetracked when we speak of the most vital problems of the people, the nation, and the republic. I must say more. We do not have—I can see this following this visit, as well—any differences of view on the need for what we have commenced, on the fact that we must decisively change the entire way in which we live in all areas and in all spheres of life, embracing everything—the economy, the social sphere, and the political process, including the Communist Party and other things... the federation, the spiritual sphere, everything. There are no differences on this. Our differences begin on another question—how to do this, by dispersing along different roads and destroying what should be reshaped and given a new quality? Or by acting together, giving oxygen to our new organism, and renewing it.

This is where our misunderstandings begin. And in this regard I should like to say one thing. I say this to everyone. Well, I have first and foremost been listening to people, and so I reject the speech by the comrade who spoke, the place where he accused me of having constantly hijacked these days here to impose my own point of view. This does not accord with the truth. Moreover, at all the meetings everywhere I began... I was asked to speak, but I began by hearing what other people had to say. So I can't even imagine that having heard and seen the way it all took place a worker could think that I have come to impose my view and not to listen. Moreover, he even said that what I have to say in my speech and my point of view are well-known, and he has, so to speak, you see, all but gotten fed up and bored with it.

I do not believe that these were his words. Workers are being exploited. Say whatever you like. I said this yesterday, as well, when I saw comrades coming out and reading from a piece of paper what were obviously not their own words. This is my opinion. As you know, I always say what I think, and I do not speak as if I am writing one thing while holding two others in my mind or 10 in my mind. In my position it would be very serious if I started acting like that. You may not agree, but I say one thing: We will resolve everything. We will master everything together, jointly, by conducting a permanent, frank, and direct dialogue; and perestroika gives unlimited opportunities for this. When we were arriving today for our meeting with the military in the building of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium, a group of Lithuanians gathered and very insistently presented to me the thought that Lithuania needs freedom. Freedom, freedom in a chorus. I said, are you not free, then. You see, if you are singing in a whole chorus, like a hymn "Freedom, freedom" and there are no consequences, you expressed your point of view, I listened and took it in. This is, above all, a real indication that freedom has come to Lithuanian territory. And it has come with

perestroika. It will put down deep roots here only if the process of perestroika continues, if perestroika puts down deep roots in the whole Union.

All of these past few days have been crammed with meetings, conversations, and discussions and, in general, it turns out that virtually the whole of Lithuania has been involved in dialogue since these meetings and conversations took place—and I am referring to my comrades who are with me,—took place in 15 rayons and towns of the republic with representatives of 40 labor collectives. And if one adds to this how many meetings there were simply in the streets and squares along the route, if one adds that everything was broadcast—live, as they say, without being shaped according to what someone likes or dislikes—so that people could see it as it happens in life, and so that they can, so to say, have second thoughts. That is also an indication of freedom, real freedom and not idle chatter about freedom. But when someone chatters about freedom, but at the same time does not permit in his newspaper two lines of contrary opinion, that is some freedom. We have done everything to ensure that the viewpoints of those who agree and disagree with us are brought to all of Lithuania and the entire country.

This is what conversation has come out as a result of these meetings, as a result of the realization of the party central committee's instruction that was given in December at the Central Committee Plenum.

And such is the scale of what has happened. And this is again my viewpoint, my position: Everything must be known to the party and to all the people—what is going on. This is our home. For the time being I think that here I am not in a corridor, to use your expression, Kazimira Pronovna; you have outlined such a fate for Lithuania: a corridor. And I thought: do they really want to make Lithuania into a public thoroughfare between this and that, or what? What a crazy idea! To move away from reality and from reliable comradeship and everything—into some corridor, a public thoroughfare, only to find oneself at a loss as to where one has gotten to. But on the whole we are finishing today's... this big political marathon that, so to speak, has been taking place here these days.

I see my task—because it belongs to the party Central Committee plenum to make final conclusions; it is its prerogative. I wanted to try to persuade you, dear comrades, to once more look at, try to assess the situation, realize the turn you are taking, the choice you are now making, in the context of and not in isolation from common processes of perestroika.

It seems to me that it will be precisely at that time that the restlessness that has arisen in our society, in this huge country, and the desire to find mutually acceptable solutions and to avoid confrontation and breakups will both become more understandable. But this is not necessary, comrades. Those who deal in real politics should see that even the smallest separatist or nationalist flareups engendered such a confrontation, and such a

flareup that in one case 1,500,000 people got involved; in another case all the 50,000,000 got involved; in yet another case...well, as it were, it is still...our people should know, should know.

I respect very much—I regard myself as belonging to a category of people who reflect on things, who are free of complexes and stereotypes, receptive to what is new, the movement of life that is alive. Otherwise there will be nothing. We will not come to understand this life, nor will we arrive at worked out policies or anything else. I respect the views of learned people. Let the president convey to all who were at this meeting—comrade Pozela—let them not take offense. It has reached me that people say that Mikhail Sergeyevich sounded a note of protest and these concepts and so forth...Well, what can you do? That is indeed why we have frankness, why we have pluralism of views, and why we have democracy, you know. After all, this is not a game with just one set of goalposts. It is your turn to get from me what you deserve. [laughter in hall] But I will return to this subject matter yet again, and not in order to give offense.

Well some philosophers spoke today. I like the field of philosophy and pursue philosophical thought and the dialectics of the mind. But what is next? Politics springs from philosophy and concepts, because if you simply have concepts alone, it is a mind game—walking about in the garden, like Aristotle, or Plato even earlier, who with his pupils threw off their white robes in Rome in order to reflect freely in the breeze and to occupy his mind. But what is next? There is a concept about what is next: politics. And next? Life is next; the life of real people, people who have their own interests, misfortunes, ups and downs, everything. That is life. Well, one must always bring one's reflection from the concept stage to life, to people's interests and so on.

One must always follow one's thoughts through from concepts to their implementation, to people's interests and so on, rather than simply playing with great notions like freedom, independence, etc. There is no absolute freedom, and nowhere will you find absolute independence, even if you were to use a 6-meter telescope, and there is no absolute self-reliance. Everything in this big world is linked, interdependent, and this dependence is growing. And politicians, academics, and politicians have to seek answers taking account of this dependence and interrelation rather than along any other avenue. I personally believe that politics cannot be successful without involving science; we've had enough of such politics. Therefore, everything we do is always the product of collective creation. It's not a question of flashes of inspiration, you realize, from some god or other. No. Nobody should claim that it is. Let's leave that to the believers.

In just the same way I believe there cannot be politics without ethics or morality, without the aspect of humanity—that, too, is impossible. That would mean technocracy, the deployment of productive forces—I'm simply mentioning two or three words to make it clear,

and so that you immediately realize what those times were like and what they resulted in for people.

So I accept all this as a politician, as a man who is today invested with great powers and with a responsibility commensurate with those powers—I accept it. But I ask you to think through to its conclusion everything that we are proposing to the people and to society, and that's why sometimes...[changes thought] I can hear—do you think I don't know? I can hear, I read that things are too slow, that we have to go faster, that we're falling behind. I can tell you that although we are not rushing, we have covered more ground in 4 years than in 70 years. That's the first thing.

Second, even without rushing and thinking everything over, we have nevertheless already made mistakes. And the history of perestroika...[changes thought] We already know what those mistakes resulted in.

One must not spur on history, processes, because they concern us above all. So if you and I are having difficulty in making things out, and often end up in the thrall of emotions, or if we keep turning out definitions, imagine how an ordinary person is supposed to understand all the complexity of the turnaround, in all its diversity, novelty, and scale. After all, in the end, he has to understand it and either accept or reject it.

So where are you rushing to? Are you not interested in man? Superheroes are again emerging. But the garb they have donned is new: the professional and academician's gown. We had one case in which we had a god-teacher of all peoples, now we have another. Harshly spoken, right? Harshly. It is not about you; it is about others, it is about others. So let us think, reflect, analyze, and compare. We have already imposed concepts, we have imposed many, and we excluded the people from this process. Lithuania, Communists, all the working people, representatives of all nationalities are taking part in what we are discussing, and I welcome that. It is only that I was not fully satisfied with the fact that during these days you all tried very hard—and not just you—to bring home only to me your own point of view.

And I say all the time: let us reflect. This, after all, is the situation, this is where we are at. This is what can happen: this way or that way. Will we keep the process in check or will we fail to do so? Let us reflect, that's all. I would not even like for these reflections to end today. This is the stage we have reached: Some people showed what they have to offer, others did, as well. For the time being—for the time being it has not happened.

No, we are still deaf—still deaf. Let us think, so that this dialogue, this exchange of views, is not broken off. And this means that we must not pile up new obstructions along the paths of this dialogue, this exchange of views—we have enough of which were piled up by the preceding decades. We need a great strength of mind to get rid of these obstructions. Let us not create new ones. The Lithuanian situation, for this is what I will call it and do not take offense—it is not the Caribbean crisis—but for

brevity's sake, simply for brevity's sake. We have come up against a situation, Comrades, which is not of republican importance but of party-wide importance, state-wide and people-wide importance. It is more than that even, bearing in mind that we are talking about the destiny of this country, its role and importance, and the implementation of the ideas that we have called perestroika.

It has to be borne in mind that these things we have come up against in connection with the results of the 20th Lithuanian communist party congress have taken place at a complicated, I would say, critical moment in the life of the country, when the question is being decided who will be the victor in the confrontation between the widening movement of the people in favor of the radical reconstruction of society and the mechanism of inertia which is slowing down progressive changes, when the processes of perestroika are only beginning to unfold in full strength, when we have embarked on a new level of interpretation of the essence itself of socialism and the tasks in its renewal and when we have come right up to and are embarking on the radical renewal of the communist party.

Never before have the possibilities for implementing the values laid down in socialist ideas been so great as they are today. It would not simply be unforgiveable, it would be the greatest mistake if we were to let pass this unique historic chance which we are given by perestroika on account of disagreements, political ambitions and all manner of prejudices and stereotypes in thought and action.

It can now be said that everyone is for perestroika. This includes the present time—here, on Lithuanian soil we have heard quite a few utterances in support of perestroika, including in this hall too. I do not know—there were no opponents, I did not hear any. But, frankly speaking, both earlier and at present, when hearing statements of this kind you perceive that while we utter identical words, we at times invest them with varying ideas. If we do not rid ourselves of this—and we can only rid ourselves of this on the basis of exchange, dialogue, comparison, one that is, moreover, an intensive exchange—if no clarity is brought into this cardinal issue, then, though words are the same, a lack of understanding may emerge, fraught with distortions when carrying out common work to implement the policy of perestroika.

This could lead to serious complications. I would like to ponder with you the future of perestroika. I believe this is quite simply essential.

I should like to say straight off that on the fundamental, broad, and historic plane, we view perestroika as a swing away from the authoritarian and centralist model of society to a humane and democratic socialism that is targeted socially on the person. Can that really divide us? But, as it happens, that has been mentioned here. Yet, after a painstaking and unbiased analysis of the path

traversed by the country and the state it has ended up in, it was the CPSU that came to the conclusion that the authoritarian and bureaucratic system that had evolved in the country, that had deformed society and the values of socialism, and that had led to ugly phenomena, grave tragedies and losses must be discarded and repudiated. Since that system neither guarantees man his genuine rights and freedoms and a life of dignity, nor society the dynamism it needs, nor the economy efficiency. It had brought the country to a state of crisis. It affected all peoples. We must see this and emerge at a new level both of thinking and of a policy for practical action.

That is perestroika's point of departure. Tell me—does that really not suit Lithuania's Communists and the working people of Lithuania? I fail to see what does not suit them.

As for the peculiarities of the stage we are going through: As it happens I dubbed it critical. We are at the stage of making decisions. There have been mass meetings. There is much that we have said. It transpires that there was lots that we had to say to one another. We have had to learn to listen. We have not learned that yet, but we are learning. And then we had to engage in drafting and formulating a policy on the basis of the analysis and the conclusions we had reached. And now—it was easier at those stages—now everything is moving. And it affects the whole country and the interests of all of us. It is for this reason that we term this stage critical. Yet all the same, comrades, notwithstanding the complex problems, we can state firmly that perestroika is forging ahead. And the processes of perestroika are under way in all the most important spheres of Soviet society.

They have touched on the very complex and subtle issue of interethnic relations, as well as the spiritual sphere, the labor collective and all the layers of society. In the public consciousness the perestroika processes are proceeding in a turbulent and contradictory fashion. This is accompanied by a revolution and great confusion in the minds. But still politicization of the country is proceeding at a rapid pace. In effect it is in the framework of democratization, glasnost, and the implementation of political and economic reform that this transition from the past administrative system is being implemented, which existed for decades, which has been fully exhausted, and which no longer has any internal energy left in the spring, as it were, to make it meet [our requirements] and work in the interests of the country, in society, and among all people.

All this is taking place on the basis of democratization, on the basis of decentralization, and on the basis of political and economic methods. Indeed, our society has greatly changed over a short period, even if one uses historical criteria to judge this. And we are now on the eve, on the threshold, of the most profound transformations. The economy must undergo the most radical changes on the basis of a fresh view of ownership and land, the position of the enterprise and the labor collective etc..

I do not want to list all the components of this process. We are moving along the path of deepening the political reform. And now in the republics, at grassroots level, the second stage of the reform is being implemented: local soviets are assuming real power and authority. We will back this up with a law on local soviets and local self-administration. All this is proceeding even now. In every sphere a very large amount of groundwork is being done for the future in all directions. But of course, we can see that all this is proceeding in an acute, contradictory, and painful way. There is a difference in perception. Not always is one thing apace with another. This adds even more to our difficulties. In any system, even in an engine and so on—although it belongs to the sphere of technology—interruptions occur. But we are dealing with a live organism encompassing so many millions of people who have their own will, their own hopes, plans, and real interests. And how can one think that there will not be any interruptions here! And if someone promises that it is possible [to proceed without interruption], that there are people like this—that one can find them—who will lead on without a hitch, he promises nonsense, comrades. This is, in the words favored by Lenin, swindling the common people. The processes will continue to proceed in a difficult and complex way. But they carry the promise that profound changes and a new quality will reach our society. I should say that now as never before we need all our perestroika progressive forces of society to be consolidated so as to prevent anyone from separating and weakening them.

I have already said, and I wish to repeat very briefly so as to be on the side of truth, we have made miscalculations and errors. And this has resulted in certain losses. And carrying out economic and political reforms we have encountered social tension. There are also signs of destabilization. The management of social and economic processes has become weaker. All this is indeed the case. But not only does this not call into doubt our choice, it prompts us to action. And we must act without turning back, without using our old methods—many people would wish to take advantage of these difficulties and reverse everything—we must act looking ahead by moving resolutely forward all the processes of perestroika.

That is where the main forces are clashing now—the adherents and opponents of perestroika. I think that, fundamentally, those who are for perestroika are in a stronger position because their position ultimately corresponds to the vital, profoundest, deep interests of the whole people. But there is a danger now of exploiting the difficulties, of sowing panic, and thereby sowing a negative attitude toward perestroika and casting doubt on it in general as a policy.

I am saying all this so that you may reflect on what your place is, how you must act in these conditions, when the country and society is experiencing these things and when the whole world is watching to see what will happen here in the Soviet Union. We have had no opportunity to pose the question of speeding up reforms.

We lacked the necessary spade-work from the point of view of scientific studies, of laws which have been passed, of the creation of legal and other prerequisites. Today those preliminary requirements are beginning to be met. In the next few months we shall practically reach the stage of making a whole range of major decisions, and this opens to us the possibility of posing in real terms, politically and practically, the question of accelerating perestroika. Thus, the transition from the system we're getting away from to the new one may be compressed, so that this pain associated with the transition may not be long drawn out. For society may not be able to endure it, and then formulas of a different order will emerge. And they are always simple and accessible to understanding. We will not need symposiums—nothing. Simply let's go and everything will be in order. True, what order and what, well, that we know, not only from our own experience. That is why we need to pool our efforts and consolidate.

Despite all the pluralism of opinions and differences in position, we cannot allow situations of conflict of different kinds to arise and grow. Those who try to kindle either social or national discord in the country—and especially political struggle—and who try to separate society under various pretexts and to set people against each other are inflicting enormous damage on our main cause.

Only civil peace and the coordination of interests based on mutuality and the active uniting of efforts on the principles of perestroika for solving the tasks and achieving the objectives of this policy can bring the country out of its present difficult situation. Any other way leads to the undermining of perestroika. We have no right to allow this. And we must act resolutely.

The complex nature of our situation with perestroika and of all the work connected with perestroika also lies in the fact that it is taking place in a country like ours, a country of many nationalities where dozens of peoples, dozens of peoples live. They have conceived enormous hopes in connection with perestroika. They cannot be deceived in these hopes and expectations. Any step, therefore, to transform this process of perestroika touches upon us and without fail acquires a national coloration. This is natural. It affects the interests of the people of the union republics, the autonomous entities and the whole federation. It has to be said bluntly that our state of many nationalities is currently going through a crucial and most difficult period. Its path is a complete and final rejection of the Stalin model of federation which declared itself to be federative but which was implanted unitarily. That is the Stalin model of federation. Today we are returning to the Leninist understanding of the nationalities question, because the pull toward integration, with the adding together of efforts in the economy, science, and politics, not only does not contradict but is inseparably linked with the raising of national self-awareness and national self-assertion.

These processes and goals are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they are organically compatible and they coincide—more than that: It is precisely in this way that we must proceed. This is because otherwise both will be harmed. In its nationalities policy, the CPSU is firmly adhering to the idea of searching for effective forms of development of republics. Each one of them may make its inimitable contribution to the renewal of socialism. The differentiation of models of economic development along the lines of economic ties and mutual relations that exist among republics—this, generally speaking, is already becoming reality. The next thing is to go over to greater flexibility of federative ties.

As you know, the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR instructed the Supreme Soviet to deal urgently with the issue of demarcation of powers of the union and the republics, in order to resolve, at the level of the Constitution, the issue of the sovereignty of republics. This is precisely how things stand. Thus, what is being resolved is a question that is currently giving rise to many controversies, a question that leads to constitutional clashes and conflict situations. The point at issue is this: In what areas does union legislation take priority and in what fields does republican legislation take priority. And now, this is, after all, how it is: That it is as though the union can take on board any question. What does this phrase mean? It means that someone in the center found something, somewhere, not to his liking: and some local question is tackled. And, you see, in this enormous country the center begins to interfere in this real, alive life, introducing what we have seen and watched and [we know] what it turned out like.

There must be a clear demarcation. This we must do together. What is the center, the way it is understood now? After all, we...[changes thought] Well, I have been listening to you all these days and you criticize so fiercely many things linked with this, that, or the other. But do criticize the past, the past policies, the past concepts. As for us, we have already embarked in all areas upon a path toward that.

You smile, meaning that no changes have allegedly taken place yet. Yes, but it is us who shape policies, in the fields of the economy, economic independence, sovereignty, powers, the federation and what it is, the party and what it is and so on. Of course what Comrade Prunskiene's team would find to its liking was that whatever they said should be accepted by Maslyukov, or someone else, without conversation. Well, then it is okay, the union is then a good one! But things do not happen this way, not this way. There are 14 more republics in the union. But it is necessary for this top echelon to be what republics want it to be. This, then, is what we are proceeding toward. That is how it ought to be. We have not arrived yet? Correct—but we are on our way.

The CPSU is true to the Leninist principle of the right of the nation to self-determination, going so far as secession. This is the constitutional norm. And if it is in the old Constitution, then I am sure that it will be in the new

Constitution, too—that is to say it is in the present one and it will be in the new one. We have no intention of foregoing this very important principle—this is very important for our state of many nationalities. I have already had occasion to speak at one meeting about the fact that merely a simplified interpretation of this constitutional provision is impermissible—that it's allegedly enough to raise one's hand and the issue is settled.

One can understand someone who is not experienced, but the person who's connected with history and politics and the realities understands that such issues are not decided like that. Everything is considerably, far more serious. Today we met the military and I have already heard some figures—the Baltic okrug alone has R21 billion in the Baltic republics. These are realities. Besides security, not to mention...[changes thought] You understand, this is all, then one has to study and sort out what has been done. We must come down, so to speak, from concepts and rottrums into life. We must discuss these problems with, for instance, the coordinating commission and this process has to be carried out normally and democratically.) The problem of secession, therefore, of secession, has deep economic, social, politico-legal, defensive, and strategic and international geopolitical aspects.

One cannot fail to take account of the interests of the whole of our union, in which the interests of all republics are interlinked and do not exist in an isolated form. Not to mention—and this is what I should have started from—the moral and psychological and purely human side of the problem, and the destinies of people of different nationalities.

And one has to consider and ponder a thousand times before any particular people or other is to set off on an independent drift without compass or map, without reserves of fuel, without a crew capable of carrying out this drifting operation, so to speak. The people have been abandoned. It's one thing for the group that are the authors of this concept to sit on an ice floe or raft—let them swim, one way or another we'll come to their rescue. But one cannot deal with a people in that way. All this is a very serious matter.

Yesterday, I was talking with peasants and workers and they are much more thorough philosophers than we are. They have such good sense. This, you know, when we describe everything as it is and what has to be done to alter everything, then this is something else for people to think about. In general the CPSU is in favor of a federation, because that makes it possible to move to the achievement of the same aims quickly, by the shorter way and painlessly: For from the viewpoint of our aims we have no contradictions with you, comrades. In any event, the basic composition of the leadership, as far as I know the position in Moscow, both in the party and in the Supreme Soviet and so on, is attached to this and that is how it will be.

And then there will be political sovereignty, economic independence, not to mention the spiritual sphere, culture, and language. And the enrichment of links which really exist, the alternation, on the basis of these principles, of the level of independence and of exchange through the market, and so forth. And all this, not on the path of destruction and disunity, but on the paths of consolidation.

Now Comrade Brazauskas has said that, given economic independence in Lithuania, how can it exist without an independent Communist Party? But I will tell you that this is an erroneous theory because economic independence nonetheless at the same time implies Lithuania as an organic, inextricable part of the whole country within the circle of all its republics. Yet the interrepublican ties which have pervaded our entire life have become even deeper than the European market. And you know that here the processes of creating international political institutions, parliaments, and so forth are already under way. And now the political idea of creating a kind of confederation or federation has been put forward. That is, Europe is uniting.

Many very eminent politicians are saying this. During a talk V. Giscard d'Estaing said to me: Mr chairman of the Supreme Soviet, prepare to deal with a federated Western Europe. The shape of this state is already appearing on the horizon, because politics follow economics. Yes, the need to be geared to the end results, to cooperate as equals, to work more effectively, gives rise to the need for a political superstructure which would serve these basic interests.

I have to say that any suspicions or political doubts with regard to a federation do not have any real basis. And I repeat yet again that we criticize past experience—all of us, you and I together; we do not have a difference of assessments or conclusions here, either. But as we criticize, we, and here we differ, we say that it is necessary to transform the federation, and you argue that it is necessary to leave the federation. And here the differences begin.

Comrades, I do not think that this is the best way, although I have indeed thrown in the phrase that we cannot—either the CPSU Central Committee nor I myself—I cannot find myself in a position where I am more Catholic than the pope, or more of a Lithuanian than you yourselves, or that I am taking greater care of the Lithuanian people's destiny, and thus to pretend that you are less concerned about this. This is even embarrassing.

You sort that out finally, and put your arguments on the all-union round table, so to speak, and we shall examine them. I see my duty merely in coming and accelerating the process of drawing up and adopting the law on the mechanism of withdrawal from the Soviet Union, on self-determination, including separation. This mechanism should exist. Since the right to self-determination exists, the mechanism is required. That much is clear. I

promise you that, although I remain committed to my firm position that we need a federation as second wind for socialism.

In a word, comrades, I hope you have understood me, and I don't propose to pretend to speak for someone else's benefit and that this does not concern you. No, it concerns everyone. Let everyone in the Soviet Union think about this—let everyone in the Soviet Union think about this.

Society today more than ever needs agreement among people of all nationalities, and let us strive for such accord. I think that this is the most important condition for the healthy and full-blooded life of our union, the common home of the Soviet nations and ethnic groups—not dragging things apart and retiring into national corners. In this regard, of course, we can speak bluntly that in the context of the vast transformations that are under way, a change of view of the party is needed. It is needed. That brings us to the topic of our present discussion, the question of the party. This is because the party, too, must, after all, be considered in the context of restructuring.

I should say at the outset that we proceed on the basis that the regeneration of our social existence requires the renewal of the party—and what is more a thorough renewal. We need a new party—in the sense of a regenerated party. I would even put it more strongly and more distinctly: What is required is a change, as Lenin put it, of our whole view not only of socialism but also of the party. I shall say more: In our country frequently both those who praise the party and those who abuse it effectively assume that it is unchanging. And even the speeches here today, and regrettably Comrade Brazauskas' speech too, implied that by and large nothing has happened in the party.

Well, for a start the party initiated restructuring. That means that something has happened in it. This would appear to merit a mention. If this had not happened, then we would not be discussing this topic. This is the first thing.

Second, let Comrade Brazauskas say how the Politburo has been hindering him from working.

A. Brazauskas: No, it is not preventing me.

M.S. Gorbachev: Or let Comrades Kuptsov and Grigoryev and the representatives of Russia and Belorussia—say how now, when certain matters have to be dealt with at oblast level, to say nothing of in republican communist parties, personnel matters—the basic issues—are settled by the communists themselves. And how! At one sitting of a plenum some five or six people are nominated. Then a week or a month is spent discussing them, and then they are elected. Well, each one has its model for democracy!

Profound processes to renew the party are under way, comrades. They are under way. But we have to build

them up gradually, so as to emerge with a new programmatic document at this stage in the party. Not a program but a programmatic document. And with a new set of rules. After all, everything must be done properly.

But we have a great penchant for altering everything in our party abruptly, first and foremost at the expense of democratization. And you will be aware of this in the near future after the examination of these questions at the Politburo and their broad discussion at the next Central Committee Plenum. Generally, though, comrades, of course the profound processes are only just starting, but already we are on the brink of great changes—in the way the party functions, in the structure of the party and in its position. And this is what I would say: It is a tragedy if the comrades are not aware of this and do not see this, and if they are hastening to isolate themselves and are seeking freedom in a closed national space. For that is not freedom. That is no longer freedom. The CPSU will sit at its plenums and congresses and resolve issues relating to the union and policy, and how to develop perestroika further. And meanwhile Comrade Brazauskas will be reading the newspapers to find out what we have decided and what the fate of Lithuania will be in connection with this. An interesting situation!

Is that really what has been conceived? No, Comrade Vilkas, you will be in the Supreme Soviet and will head a commission?

E. Vilkas: Let them resolve the questions there.

M.S. Gorbachev: But why have a party at all, then? Or is that what you want? To bury it here first, and then transfer the experience there? [laughter] If that's the case say so! [applause]

We will not get by without the party. More than that, other parties are already appearing here amongst you. We won't get by without them. There are parties throughout the world and will be in any society. There were and there will be. How many and so on. True, there is a saying that only a multiparty system will save everything. But you know, I look and see how some people, through the multiparty system, through the creation of new institutions, simply try to obtain as many portfolios as possible. Never mind, they say, we will explain to the people later, put them in the picture. The main thing is to have a few more positions, and compete in, you know, logomachy. No, that is not democracy.

We know of dozens of states with 10 or 20 parties which were still dictatorial regimes. And they still have not freed themselves from them. Comrades, everything is determined by the operation of political power, the level of democracy and of political processes, the functioning of its structures and of public opinion and of public movements which are capable of accumulating and expressing and reporting back these interests. If there is no democratic environment or glasnost nobody will report or implement any interests. But we have all embarked down the path of democratization, glasnost

and decentralization. This makes everything possible. (?I add): hand power to the Soviets. Then the people themselves join in all these processes. That is where the answers to all these questions are.

The CPSU's strategy of renewal consists of a fundamental change in both its status and its role in Soviet society on the basis of the division of functions—I won't go into details—in its relations with all the public and political groupings: All the things to which perestroika has given rise. And this means ridding the party of its infallibility complex, its claims to leadership of all and everything, and its political monopolism. The CPSU must be a party that serves the people, realizes the people's interests through its policies, and is under their democratic control. In other words, the party is at the service of the people. In two words, it must be a political force, an organization that is self-managing, self-developing, and self-renewing. It must be open to both theoretical research and to political debates and the confrontation of standpoints—and that means reconsidered from the point of view of the democratic processes of the party itself. And the principle of democratic centralism must be reconsidered and you will see how we shall present it. And of course, Comrades, I must...[changes thought] I think that perestroika, if renewal is to be implemented by the party in one proposal, by one thesis, it must go in the direction of implementing the Leninist idea that the authority of the party masses should triumph in the party.

The party masses must form the primary party organizations and elect directly, not through the bureau, all the committees—elect their leaders. They must influence the formation and work of the rayon and city committees and elect directly. They must influence the election of delegates, right up to the Central Committee.

And if that is so then why, you ask should we break away? So you must elect your delegates to the CPSU congress and there you can raise the question through those delegates and decide perhaps even about the general secretary or about the chairman of the party, or the Politburo or the presidium and so on. Those are some thoughts with which I'm rounding off, as it were, so as not to go into them more deeply.

And finally, in those new rules we must of course reflect the new position of the communist parties of the union republics. That must be an independent section, with independent communist parties possessing really enormous possibilities. Are we going to dictate to them what their membership dues should be, or how their apparatus should be structured, or what its numbers should be or what publishing activities it should engage in? No. All that must be removed in the new rules. And then the question arises, if all that exists, if the Communist Party is represented in all spheres of the leadership and takes part in all the processes, then for what more do you need independence? You have it. So all that is achieved

without losing the advantages of participation and of the sustaining presence of all the communist parties of the union republics, republics.

As Comrade Brazauskas or someone else said, I want to end on a positive note. And so I think these days have not been wasted. They haven't been wasted. And not just for us, I hope, comrades—since all this is open, to the whole country and the whole world—that they have given much food for thought to everyone. I only hope that, all the same, in spite of the fact that we have here presented each other with a register of demands, as it were, we have nonetheless laid a good foundation for hoping that by continuing the dialogue, now within the framework of the party Central Committee plenum, we shall find an answer to the question of what to do to take into account the worries and interests of the Lithuanian Communist Party and of that part that has remained within the positions of the CPSU. Well I don't want to name the Lithuanian Communist Party as having abandoned the positions of the CPSU and so on. I can't even bring myself to say it. I still feel that I'm among party comrades, so to speak. Yes, I think we must think. I have received from you agreement, from the two wings, so to speak, and the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee and your leading organs, that we should continue this dialogue and try, with the participation of the plenum of the Central Committee, to find a formula that will both reflect the needs that have come to a head and at the same time won't weaken the CPSU.

I think that you felt that everything that—comrade, I don't know your name, you stood up and said—this is in your charter—yes—You felt that the CPSU would even—and I, incidentally, told Comrade Brazauskas this—submit all your proposals, the most far-reaching ones, for examination by the 28th Congress.

Okay, I think that there is an opportunity for comrades, for your bureau to think about it and bring their proposals to the plenum and say: that is it. I know that they exist and so I hope that they will bring them. In general, let's think and act very responsibly. You and I are at such a stage of perestroika and we are adopting such decisions that we cannot make mistakes. You understand? This will be too costly for our people, for the whole cause of socialism and for the destiny of the world. I am counting on this cooperation. [applause]

Question: You are for a one-party or multiparty system in the Soviet Union? Which gives the better guarantee of the process of democratization?

M.S. Gorbachev: I think I have already replied to this question in numerous speeches of mine. Comrades, I will tell you frankly—everything should be determined by the course of the political process. I don't see any tragedy in a multiparty system if it should arise in reality and meets the interests of society. I don't see anything bad in this at all. Incidentally, after the revolution we formed the government and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee on a multiparty basis. So this multiparty

system is not something we should avoid like the plague. No, all I'm saying is that there is no need for it to be foisted on us artificially.

That's the first thing. Second, I repeat and repeat again. A multiparty system is no panacea. The most important things are democracy and glasnost and the true participation and inclusion via all political and public institutes of our people in the real process.

Otherwise these parties will again cheat [obyegorivat] on us, as they might if this doesn't happen. [laughter, applause] And they will swindle the common people by their political games, leaving the people themselves—the main characters—outside the framework of the political process and true people's power.

This suits some societies but not us. That is all. [applause]

A. Brazauskas: Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed Politburo members, esteemed guests! Today we have spent nearly 4 hours on a very complex, very tense conversation. A conversation which, I would say, was even in many ways incomprehensible to each other. But in many ways comprehensible. I shall not repeat the rebukes and doubts concerning our life and our affairs in our small republic. Of course, there are many questions and problems throughout our state. We have problems which correspond to all-union problems and other problems specific to ourselves. Understandably, that is how it could be and how it is.

Much has become clear over this week. Of course, the main aim, as I understand it, was to understand each other as much as possible, as well as possible, and as comprehensively as possible. If this has been achieved successfully, then fine. If not, that is bad. I think that we have not succeeded in understanding everything, but we have probably succeeded in understanding much that is being done in our republic. We understand the complexity of the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party and in that connection in the CPSU, but life is what you make it. We also spent a long time after the congress considering what additional steps we could take and what more we could do. How could we speak even better about our intentions and feelings? About the opportunities for even greater rapprochement and mutual understanding. But I think time will do its job and perestroika, during which our entire country is marching in the same direction, the right direction, every day, will also do its job. It cannot be said that our republic is not proceeding along this path. It is proceeding along this path at a slightly different stride, perhaps, it is shorter or longer in some fields of our life, but that is perestroika, life as it is lived.

Mikhail Sergeyevich! You visited us 9 years and 6 months ago. Now you are visiting us again—with a big group. You have always remembered Lithuania with kind words: How it has grown up, how much has been done in this small region. You always remembered people. I should like to take this opportunity and in

connection with the completion of our talk today and of your visit to the republic, that over this period of nearly 10 years Soviet Lithuania has become even more beautiful, and the people of all nationalities living in our republic, beginning with the Lithuanians, who are in the majority, have become even better. If we do not understand something when someone else is speaking, we must seek to understand. I think that is not such an obstacle that we cannot surmount it. We are and remain optimists.

I should like to cordially thank you, Raisa Maksimovna, and all comrades here in the auditorium and the entire group which has been with us for a whole week. To thank them for the work, for the fact that you have given so much time to us. Perhaps extreme expressions have been heard on the streets and here and in other auditoriums and perhaps there have been extreme slogans and posters on both sides—well, life's like that. I think the main section, the core of the people of Lithuania, is traveling along the correct path and traveling with awareness, and when a people travels with awareness it seems to me they are always right. Thank you very much, comrades. [Applause].

M.S. Gorbachev: I am saying goodbye to you. Let's think. You must think and so must we. But the main thing—let's resolve the enormous tasks upon which we have embarked. We have no other path. All the best to you! I want to thank all the working people of Lithuania, everyone who lives here—Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, and all other people—for the interest they have displayed in the arrival of the comrades and in my arrival personally. We have seen such lively interest, emotion, and concern. People wanted to tell us their thoughts and opinions. And we strove to speak sincerely with them. Because you cannot mess around with people. You must set forth your position as you understand it. I think all the working people of Lithuania for the contribution they have made to this great, even enormous, talk. Thank you. [applause].

Brazauskas Speech

*PM1601143390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jan 90 Second Edition pp 4-5*

[Speech by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, at 13 January Lithuanian party aktiv meeting]

[Text] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed comrades! Today each one of us and all of us together are trying to make a preliminary assessment of the results of the work in Lithuania of the CPSU Central Committee delegation headed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. As you know, it has familiarized itself with the state of affairs in the Lithuanian Communist Party following the 20th congress. This is the first time in 50 years of Soviet power that a head of the Soviet state and a general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has visited us in Lithuania.

I wish to point out with satisfaction that this visit is taking place under the leadership of the person with whose name we associate the positive changes which have enabled all the people living on our planet to feel more secure and more friendly toward each other. We who stand at the brink of nuclear self-destruction have acquired hope that global problems will be resolved on the eve of the third millennium. The priorities of the panhuman values proclaimed by the policy of new thinking have transformed relations among states and peoples literally in the space of a few years.

The time that has elapsed since the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, the arrival of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the group of Central Committee members, and today's possibly very unpleasant discussion make us return once again to what prompted Lithuanian Communists to adopt such extraordinary decisions. To formulate our aspirations with the utmost brevity, there was the proposal to transform relations between the union and its corresponding subjects in both the state and the economic sphere, as well as the political sphere. The chief question of concern to us today and, naturally, to the CPSU leadership is the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Therefore it is evidently necessary to emphasize once again what, in our opinion, gave rise to these steps. First, a comprehensive analysis of the political situation in the republic convincingly showed that only an independent Communist Party can enjoy the trust of Lithuania's inhabitants, and only on this basis will it be able to remain in the political arena as a serious political force. Only in this way can the slogan "The people's plans are the party's plans" become reality. The question being put by some people—Does our desire for independence mean mistrust of the CPSU?—does not reflect the real state of affairs, since it attests to a failure to understand the processes taking place in Lithuania.

Second, the development of democracy and of the people's self-management and social justice—which is advocated by the progressive part of the CPSU, as we understand it—is also the flag of the Communists of Lithuania. But these principles can be realized in practice only if an independent Communist Party appears in the political arena.

Third, the profound consequences of the socioeconomic crisis cannot be effectively overcome if the party's status runs counter to the concept of the republic's economic independence. An independent Communist Party will ensure the proper and equal holding of the first truly democratic elections to the republic Supreme Soviet and the local soviets in the postwar years.

Fourth, today everyone admits that perestroika, which was proclaimed more than 4 years ago, is lagging behind most of all, as the republic's communists have stated, within the CPSU itself. Despite various proposals, including ours, the situation in the CPSU has still hardly changed in practice to this day. Time does not wait. As life shows, the situation in the country, as well as in our

republic, is changing almost daily. In the opinion of many communists the decisions, the documents which it is only now intended to submit to party members for discussion—we hope that this will be done in the very near future—should have been announced earlier. For the chief condition of a successful policy is to ascertain interests in time and to resolve them in time. Therefore the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party is a command of the times, a specific manifestation of perestroika in party life, and, accordingly, our vision of the future of the CPSU as an alliance of independent Communist Parties.

The Communist Party's independence also means a new form of link with the CPSU in keeping with the spirit of perestroika, and it is the desire of the majority of the republic's communists; this independence in the spirit of the ideas of perestroika accords with the democratic, humanist orientation for the building of socialism, not the bureaucratic-centralist orientation. These are the main reasons that dictated the need to create an independent Communist Party.

This opinion emerged not because of someone's personal interest but on the initiative of the overwhelming majority of primary party organizations. This initiative was manifested in particular in the process of the elections of congress delegates, which became a kind of party referendum. The 20th congress had to take place, for today it is possible to resolve questions of the fate of perestroika only by means of collective wisdom. The time has come to answer the questions: What has been done, how are we to act now, in the name of what goal are we implementing perestroika, how do we understand this goal, and what do we expect on the way to it?

What, then, did the congress give us? First, we adopted program documents, which were published in the republic press, and they elicited an amicable, positive assessment from the majority of the republic's inhabitants.

Second, we dissociated ourselves from the past, from repressions and the crimes of Stalinism. The congress made an assessment of the events of our contradictory and tragic past. Third, we renewed the Central Committee and substantially changed and are still changing our work methods and relations among Communists within the party itself. It must be pointed out that today we can already state that our steps have received great support from the republic's inhabitants. In addition, whereas a considerable section of Communists left the Lithuanian Communist Party last year, now, I must say, approximately 300 people have already joined the party in the space of a few weeks.

We hope, Mikhail Sergeyevich and esteemed comrades, that the Lithuanian Communist Party's decisions, after being discussed at the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum and after the visit by the group of Central Committee and Politburo members and Mikhail

Sergeyevich Gorbachev himself, will be more understandable and that this understanding will be the basis for adopting a corresponding decision at the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum. We in turn will adhere to the principles of cooperation with the CPSU set forth in our documents and, in particular, in the appeal to the CPSU Central Committee plenum. The thought heard all the time at meetings, in conversations with the CPSU delegation, and in the central press is: Lithuania wants to secede, wants to be an independent state. As a rule, this is presented as a negative, separatist aspect, signifying almost a betrayal of perestroika. Almost never, with the exception of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum, has this question been raised: Why do the peoples not want to live in such a union?

This really is incomprehensible to some people, particularly when processes of integration and closer unification are taking place all over Europe. Mikhail Sergeyevich has repeatedly said: "You have not yet lived in a renewed federation. And you already want to leave it."

Indeed, we have not yet lived. But really, why? I will attempt to give a brief answer to this question.

The first reason. These are the historical circumstances of the independent state of Lithuania's joining the USSR. I will not go into details here. But the reasons are such that they cannot fail to wound the national pride of a people with an 800-year history of statehood, not to mention the fact that this brought immeasurable tragedies to thousands of families and became an open wound in the people's consciousness. In exchange for this there was economic aid, this is correct, and the economy's very dynamic development and, I would even say, a certain forcing of the republic's sociopolitical system, sometimes regardless of local possibilities and local production factors.

The second reason is the unjust—with regard to many nations—state-federative system of the Union itself up until now; I wish to emphasize, up until now. This was dictated, it may be said in different ways, by the interests of the very rigid former hierarchical centralization, which, perhaps, is justified and was in actual fact justified during the years of the very cruel war and to some extent gave privileges to individual nations against others.

The third reason is the failed economic experiment of the Stalinist model of socialism and, I would even say, also the obvious crisis of the technocratic utopias in whose name the truly Marxist guidelines for democratization, social justice, and deliverance from alienation in all spheres were sacrificed. As the Lithuanian Communist Party program adopted at the 20th congress stated: "The essence of Communists' actions is to free the person from economic oppression, social spontaneity, and alienation." The way out is socialism, which communists perceive as an association in which the free development of each person is a condition of universal

free development. Today we are essentially returning to what was not realized in Lenin's testament to the party. Life has confirmed the correctness of Lenin's understanding of the nations' self-determination.

Of course, quite a different time is on the calendar today, and so other solutions are needed. However, there can be no Union without the real principle of self-determination. For this it is necessary to draw up a mechanism for realizing the right to self-determination. Possessing it, the peoples will feel different and will adopt corresponding decisions. Because of different historical circumstances and levels of political consciousness, political questions and also the requirements for democracy and independence in the union republics are not identical. Hence stem the complexity and difficulties in regulating them. Therefore a different approach is needed, a rejection of universal solutions in the course of political reform.

Such a precedent already exists. It is the concept of the Baltic republics' economic independence. Why can this approach not be transferred to political and also party structures? It is right here, if we really abandon the standardized approach, that the possibility lies of resolving the problems that have arisen in connection with the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress decisions.

Implementing the Lithuanian Communist Party's program guidelines for restoring statehood, it is becoming the Lithuanian Communist Party's most important aim to define the possibility of Lithuania's political development over the next few years and also for the longer term. The path to sovereignty is a process with its own strategy and sequence. If we failed to take account of this, the political and economic reality, we would take risks with people's destinies and with everything that we have already achieved with such great difficulty. On the whole, this can be defined as a phased transition from the status of a sovereign union republic to a status of a higher level of statehood for individual republics.

Such is the Lithuania in which these processes have already begun today. It will have its own economy and production priority, a combination of forms of ownership, and its own sociopolitical structure. To this end we are already striving today for equitable mutually advantageous economic cooperation with central organs, with all union organs, with all union republics. At this stage it is important to achieve genuine economic independence and to assert true political pluralism and parliamentary democratism.

Today we frequently hear charges that Lithuania intends to break off all economic ties with the Soviet Union. But we do not call for Lithuania's economic separation or its self-isolation. It is a question of qualitatively new economic ties based on the development of new market relations and many other economic levers. Economic independence, not isolationism under conditions of the

all-union and world market, is the essence of the Law on the Baltic Republic's Economic Independence, which is being implemented.

The law can only be realized by way of equivalent commodity exchange and mutually advantageous contact, with new forms of ownership and the shaping of an effective financial and monetary system. In addition, if you also take account of the circumstance that the republic's economy is almost two-thirds dependent on the USSR's raw material resources and is interwoven with cooperative ties with more than thousands of the country's enterprises, then there is no path other than cooperation.

Of course, there are people in the republic who do not understand or do not want to understand this. It is necessary to carry out broad, consistent explanation. Both we, the Central Committee, and, I believe, union organs must do this. Unfortunately, the population receives plainly inadequate information of this kind. We must inevitably take all partners into account, if we want them to take us into account.

In traveling the path of realizing the republic's economic independence, we are seeking to qualitatively restructure and improve economic ties with the whole union and with foreign countries, while at the same time forming new sources for markets of technology, raw materials, and fuel. This will take years of mutual understanding and changes to the structures and mechanism of management, without which, although working better, we cannot lead a richer and happier life.

I would like separately to take a moment to speak also about national problems. They are constantly accentuated at all meetings in our republic. Yes, a section of the Lithuanian population is concerned about the political process in the republic. This is understandable. People must not be blamed for misunderstood nationalism. This is not their fault. It is the party's misfortune because of the Stalinist nationalities policy which led to this situation. We see this everywhere, both here and in other republics. Therefore the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee program states the following, and I quote: "Without fostering love and respect for one's own people and for the assets accumulated by them, it is impossible to foster a real internationalist who perceives his own people not in an egocentric manner but in the context of the worldwide community of nations." The Lithuanian Communist Party opposes chauvinism, nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and discrimination against a people. Concern will be shown in Lithuania for the education and culture of national minorities, and conditions will be created for them to maintain ties with the historical motherland. We intend to implement this unswervingly. So there are no grounds for speaking of refugees, of oppression, or of one nation rising above another. And I believe that domestic nationalism, as we call it, is not yet an indicator of the Lithuanian people's true feelings.

We are striving for a democratic society in which the basic humanist ideals of socialism, the person's freedom, and social justice are realized. This does not run counter to the interests of any nation, nor to any national minority living outside its own historical motherland.

In concluding, I wish to express the hope that these days of the guests' stay in Lithuania will promote mutual understanding. This is what Lithuania's Communists wish for. I hope that you have been convinced of this, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

On this note of good hopes I would like to end my speech.

Burokyavichyus Address

*PM1601140490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Speech by M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform), at 13 January Lithuanian party aktiv meeting in Vilnius]

[Text] Dear Comrades! Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich!

First, let me say a few words about this. I did not participate in the repressions or deportations. On 16 July 1988 I published in the newspaper LITERATURA IRMYANAS [as transliterated] my first article on questions reflecting the national rebirth processes that were beginning in the republic at that time. Since then I have published 14 more articles—I defend my position everywhere. So I appear before you as you know me from my press articles and television appearances. Yesterday, after my speech in Shyaulay, I had received many threats and insults by 3 am—that is how things are.

Today we are not only discussing the results of the CPSU Central Committee December Plenum on the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of our party's Central Committee. At the present stage in the development of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the state of crisis that has gripped the Lithuanian Communist Party as a component part of the CPSU is very worrying to us Lithuanian Communists, members of the CPSU. I believe that stagnationist thinking on the subject of perestroika in the activity of the CPSU and the detachments of union republic Communist Parties is unacceptable. In my opinion they should base their activity primarily on the CPSU's experience of perestroika in the country and on the CPSU's activity to renew socialism in the USSR.

The basis of the renewal of the Communist Party is enshrined in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum. Apparently documents will be published in the near future to define the direction of the CPSU's future development. In this context the fragmentation of the CPSU into autonomous political parties without a common program or statute documents will weaken the Soviet Union and could create a threat to the existence of a multinational Soviet state. After all,

the objective of the country's Communists is, through perestroika, to create a democratic, rule-of-law, socialist, federal, humane state that would guarantee the free development of the individual.

What factors define the CPSU as an integrated political organization? The following, in my opinion: First, the resolution of theoretical problems; second, the definition of practical tasks to renew socialism; third, the resolution of tactical questions of party activity, and fourth, the resolution of organizational questions in the Soviet Union's development. These, taken together, are the reasons why I am opposed to the radical decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, which in effect mean the secession of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the CPSU. I think that the Lithuanian Communist Party that was newly registered on 28 December 1989 could, under its statutes, suspend until the 28th CPSU Congress the operation of the document stating that from 21 December 1989 the CPSU Program and Statutes have lost their force for Lithuanian Communist Party organizations.

The 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress documents also set the date of registration of membership of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Mention is also made of the exchange of CPSU membership cards for Lithuanian Communist Party membership cards. All this means the organizational division, separation, of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the CPSU. These steps will weaken the Lithuanian Communist Party and prevent it from participating with full force in the CPSU's activity to formulate party policy on the development of the country as a whole or individual aspects of its sector structures.

The question naturally arises: How can it be possible to accelerate the development of the Lithuanian SSR and successfully carry out perestroika here from a separatist standpoint? I am convinced that if we renew the CPSU Program, draft and adopt new CPSU Statutes incorporating a separate section on union republic Communist Parties, define the status of autonomy of a union republic Communist Party within the renewed CPSU, incorporate in the CPSU membership card a page giving the name of the union republic Communist Party in the national language, and make the top officials of union republic Communist Parties members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo or Secretariat, then many of the questions that are galvanizing Communists today will fade away.

Therefore, I believe that the Lithuanian Communist Party's perestroika can still form part of the CPSU's perestroika, and in this way the Lithuanian Communist Party will help to solve the problems that face the entire Soviet Union and the Lithuanian SSR.

I am profoundly convinced that consideration for national peculiarities and specific republican characteristics need not lead to the Lithuanian Communist Party's separation from the CPSU. After all, at the present stage

the CPSU is not hampering the combination of national and international [internatsionalnyye] aspects in the activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party. I said those words, and I fell to thinking: The nationalities question exists in Lithuania, and the time has come to tackle it skillfully. If ethnic contradictions deteriorate, the crisis in social life will be exacerbated still further. We have declared Lithuanian the state language in the republic. That is very good. But the introduction of Lithuanian in places where there is a dense concentration of Russian and Polish populations has not been properly thought through. We Lithuanians, who make up the vast majority of the republic's population, should be more attentive toward other nationalities, the Russians and Poles living on Lithuanian territory. We condemned and continue to condemn Stalinism, including the crimes committed by the Stalinist leadership against the Lithuanian people.

Full civil rights are being restored to the citizens of Lithuania who were deported by the Stalinist leadership, and the historical past and cultural heritage of the Lithuanian people are being restored. The results are obvious. But I cannot agree with the one-sided coverage of certain historical phenomena, in particular the silence over the revolutionary events in Lithuania in 1918-1919 and the depiction of Lithuania's development within the USSR purely in black. The assertion that we have only the ruins of a Lithuanian culture and that it must now be resurrected sounds very strange and entirely illogical. After all, the Lithuanian intelligentsia today is a cultural phenomenon, and if you examine the works of the republic's scientists, writers, and artists it is clear that culture, in the broad sense of the word, has developed on an ascending line. Indisputably, everything negative that took place with regard to culture must be discarded.

In the republic, historians do not give a uniform assessment of the Lithuanian Communist Party's historical past. The prevalence of the nihilistic view of the Lithuanian Communist Party's history frightens me. After all, the desire to show that in the years of bourgeois domination, and in particular in 1938-1939, the Lithuanian Communist Party was not autonomous, but was only fulfilling the will of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), is not in accordance with historical reality. In the years in question the Lithuanian Communist Party had ties neither with the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) nor with the Comintern.

Nor is the assertion that the Lithuanian Communist Party never defended Lithuania's independence in accordance with historical truth. The question arises: For what purpose are all these assertions being made? When you read the newspapers and magazines, listen to the radio, or watch television, the purpose becomes clear: It is only now, they say, after the 20th Congress, that the Communist Party has become autonomous and independent, and only this kind of Lithuanian Communist Party can protect the Lithuanian people's interests.

That, basically, is how the Lithuanian Communist Party's secession from the CPSU is justified.

There is another justification that is used. What it amounts to is that Bolshevism and its founder destroyed Russian [rossiyskiy] social democracy. On this basis Bolshevism as a political phenomenon is condemned. It is not acknowledged to be an ideological and organizational current of Russian social democracy. It is no accident that the Lithuanian Communist Party program approved at the 20th Congress does not even contain the word "Leninism."

The idea of the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state (not within the Soviet Union), which is being propounded through the press, radio, and television and at rallies, has a grip on the minds of certain strata of the Lithuanian population. I believe that at the present stage in our country's development objective conditions dictate very close, organic ties between the Lithuanian SSR and all the Soviet republics and create the prerequisites for Lithuania's all-around development only within the Soviet Union.

It is indisputable that Lithuania's socialist statehood should be constantly supplemented by new content, particularly legal content. Soviet Lithuania, like the other union republics, should have real sovereignty as a socialist state. But to that end it is necessary to create a cooperative system [kooperatsiya] of socialist states within the Soviet Union, in a Leninist interpretation. The CPSU Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet and government of the USSR should do intensive work on this.

All these questions are connected with the activity of Lithuania's Communists. The connection is twofold. It is related to the assessment of Lithuania's statehood. Some people idealize the bourgeois Lithuanian state, pushing the idea that life was good for everyone then, and forgetting that, solely according to official statistics, 80,000 people emigrated from that state between 1923 and 1939. I am an opponent of the nihilistic view with regard to that state. But the bourgeois Lithuanian state should not be elevated above the socialist statehood of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian Communist Party crisis is also associated with crisis phenomena in the life of the socialist countries' communist parties. We should not imitate the negative phenomena in those countries. However, negative processes are also seizing the communist movement in Lithuania. The reality now is that two Communist Parties have been created in Lithuania. Only one of them is not part of the CPSU, while the other is part of the CPSU.

The main question that divides them is the question of the Lithuanian SSR's future paths of development. The Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform upholds Lithuania's development within the Soviet Union. I believe that the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which broke off its work in December of last

year, will in January assess the real situation in Soviet Lithuania and take account of the fact that in effect two Communist Parties exist in the republic. If a confrontation develops between them, the communist movement in the republic is threatened by great danger. The question arises: Why? The fact is that the debate forced on the Lithuanian Communist Party has weakened its organizational and ideological activity, while opposition forces have prepared politically, in a very well organized way, for the nomination of candidate people's deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. All this could affect the composition of the republic's future Supreme Soviet.

The Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform will be guided by the ideas of humanism, democracy, and internationalism, and will express the aspirations of all the peoples living in the republic. It is indisputable that at the present stage of Lithuania's development along the path of socialist renewal, pan-human values acquire paramount significance. These panhuman values include, in my view, the future federal structure of the Soviet Union, in which Soviet Lithuania will develop freely.

To conclude my speech, I would like to say that our aim is to help the working class, socialist rural workers, and the people's intelligentsia of the republic to fulfill their historic task of renewing the socialist society together with all the peoples of the Soviet Union. Soviet power, socialism—that is the path along which Lithuania must develop.

'Sigma' Worker's Comments

PM1701095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed account of speech by L. Vebra, regulator at the "Sigma" Production Association, exchanges with M.S. Gorbachev, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary A. Brazauskas at 13 January Lithuanian party aktiv meeting in Vilnius]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed guests, and members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. [Passage omitted]

I am going to be critical but, pardon me, I am expressing the opinion of those who stand on the platform of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. We had expected you to meet with us more. You should have learned more of our opinion. But I did not see this while watching television, and somehow you wished more to express your own opinion. Pardon me, but we already see your opinion on television from Moscow, in your letters, and in your decisions and appeals to us. Your opinion seems clear to us, but you should learn ours, which is what we want.

M.S. Gorbachev: But you know, you had not yet begun speaking, but I already realized what your opinion is....

Vebra: Pardon me, but we have had enough....

Gorbachev: And you pardon me too.

Vebra: All right.

Brazauskas: Be brief. Time is pressing.

Vebra: So why have we decided to organize the Lithuanian Communist Party? We wanted to be independent, so that the center would not have to give us permission for particular rights. We would like rights to proceed from bottom to top, not from top to bottom. Perestroyka is under way now, which is good, and we all support and respect you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, but the point is that you will not be at the helm forever and you have 9 years at most left. We do not know what will happen after that or who will come in; and what if conservative forces gain the upper hand? [Passage omitted]

Gorbachev Addresses Baltic Commanders 13 Jan

LD1301143490 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1350 GMT 13 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius, 13 Jan (TASS)—A meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and leaders of military units stationed on the territory of the republic took place in the hall of sessions of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium today.

Participating in it were: V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; V. Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium; V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy; Colonel General F.M. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District; and Admiral V.P. Ivanov, commander of the Baltic Fleet.

Issues connected with further improving the activity of the army and navy units personnel in conditions of perestroyka were examined. It was stressed that there is a need in the republic to observe Soviet legislation on which our servicemen's norms of life and service are based. Many participants in the meeting spoke in favor of intensifying attention paid to the social and domestic needs of servicemen's families.

Those assembled made speeches to the effect that the Soviet Army and fleet are steadfastly true to the CPSU's policy of perestroyka.

M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the meeting.

Gorbachev's Remarks on Lithuanian Stay Cited

'Not Spent in Vain'

LD1301191590 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT
13 Jan 90

["Mikhail Gorbachev—Address—Expanded Summary"—TASS headline]

[Text] Vilnius January 13 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee and President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev has described his stay in Lithuania as "days not spent in vain."

He was in this Baltic republic in accordance with the decision of the December (1989) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum had discussed matters connected with the decisions of the Lithuanian Communist Party's [LCP] 20th Congress on the establishment of an independent republican party organisation.

Questions concerning not only the independence of the LCP but also the possibility of the republic's secession from the Soviet Union were raised during Gorbachev's numerous meetings with people in the republic.

Speaking at a meeting of republican party activists in the Lithuanian capital today, Gorbachev emphasised that the CPSU is true to the Leninist principles of the right of nations to self-determination, right up to secession.

This provision is also present in the current Constitution of the USSR. At the same time he cautioned against simplified interpretations of the secession thesis.

The problem of secession has many aspects, including economic, legal and international, Gorbachev said. He specially touched upon the moral aspect of the problem, emphasising the need to take into account the interests of people of all nationalities living in Lithuania.

The Soviet president described as "false" the thesis about the impossibility of Lithuania's economic sovereignty without an independent communist party.

Having pointed out that the leaders of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party are right when they criticise the experience of the past, he at the same time noted the erroneous character of their attempts to resolve the republic's problems through secession from the federation. The federation should be transformed, Gorbachev emphasised.

Having remarked that a mechanism for the self-determination of the republics, right up to secession, is yet to be worked out, the Soviet leader said that the main condition for normal life is alliance, and not "dispersal to the chosen ethnic corners."

Gorbachev emphasised that everything can be solved jointly through a constant frank and direct dialogue. "Perestroika provides unlimited possibilities for this. Freedom has already come to Lithuanian soil with perestroika and will deepen only provided the perestroika process goes on and strike deep roots throughout the union," he said.

The Soviet leader stressed that in principle perestroika means transition from the authoritarian-centralist model of society to humanitarian, democratic socialism. Having analysed thoroughly the path traversed by the country and its present state, he said, it was the CPSU which came to the conclusion that the authoritarian-bureaucratic system, which had deformed society, should be rejected.

"We have reached a critical stage, that of taking decisions," Gorbachev stressed. "Despite the problems and difficulties, we can firmly declare that perestroika is moving forward, that its processes are under way in all the vital spheres of Soviet society." He stressed that in the framework of democratisation, glasnost, political and economic reform a transition is being effected from the past system of management that has fully exhausted itself to the new one.

Having noted that legal, scientific and other prerequisites for speeding up the transformations in the country are emerging now, Gorbachev said: "In the next few months we will take a whole complex of major decisions that will open the way for the real acceleration of perestroika."

Differentiating models of economic development has already become a reality and more flexible federal ties is the next logical step, the Soviet president said.

Touching upon the state of affairs within the CPSU, Gorbachev stressed the need to change views of the party's place in society. He pointed out that the renewal of socialism also calls for the renewal of the CPSU.

Gorbachev said that fundamental changes are now being prepared in the party. He described as a negative phenomenon the fact that some Lithuanians fail to notice these phenomena and try to isolate themselves.

Speaking of demands for a transition to a multiparty system that are now quite often advanced in the country, Gorbachev stressed that a multiparty system in itself is not a guarantee of democratic society. It is the regime of political power, democratic environment and glasnost that provide such guarantees.

The CPSU leader emphasised that the party should become a constantly renewing organisation in which rank-and-file members would have an opportunity to shape party leadership through direct elections.

Opportunities for the realisation of values inherent in socialist ideas have never been as great as nowadays. It would be the greatest error if the unique historical

chance, offered by perestroyka, is missed owing to differences, political ambitions, every kind of prejudices, stereotypes of thinking and action, Gorbachev emphasised.

He called on Lithuanian Communists to take responsible and well-considered decisions.

'Stability Will Be Preserved'

PM1401180390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 1

[L. Kapelyushnyy report: "Search for Solutions. IZVESTIYA Own Correspondent Reports From Vilnius"]

[Excerpts] I had a rare opportunity to put a question to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and I admit I blew it. I left my main question "until last," when I should have started with it... This is what happened. Squeezed hopelessly away from the aisle in the assembly shop, I was asking a group of assembly workers what they expected from Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to Lithuania. And at that moment M.S. Gorbachev turned toward us.

Thanks to television, I have often seen Mikhail Sergeyevich's meetings with an unprepared audience, which requires the ability to speak the truth and answer the most pressing questions. But it was only now, finding myself cheek to cheek with events, so to speak, that I came to understand the secret of these meetings' attraction. It lies in the general secretary's sincere interest in obtaining information at first hand. He spoke with numerous people, spending 2 hours going from shop to shop in this enormous plant and not repeating himself once... Workers repeated themselves in their questions. My interlocutors were no exception and asked: Why is the economic reform stalling, why are cooperatives' prices exorbitant and who is protecting them, when can changes for the better be expected?

The general secretary explained. And drew interlocutors into the conversation. This was how my buildup to my main question began.

"Sooner or later we will cope with food and goods. But will we be able to maintain in the fatherland the level of political stability that will enable the government to concentrate on the urgent economic, ecological, cultural, and technical questions.

"Stability, incidentally, is one of the most frequent questions that IZVESTIYA readers ask the correspondents' office."

"We must preserve stability," M.S. Gorbachev said. "I believe that we will preserve it. But this requires efforts not only by the government. Maybe it depends primarily on every citizen... Perestroyka, especially on this kind of scale, could never have proceeded smoothly. Just recall what happens in a house when you start repairs? The furniture gets moved around, and you can't find the

things you need in their usual places. And so on. And both factors get in the way of completing the job.

"So what is happening in the country today can be compared with being sick, with a sick feeling which would best be cured by going to bed and staying there, only things don't allow you to... You have to summon up the strength. To force yourself through the pain barrier."

[Kapelyushnyy] And what is your attitude to self-healing?

Mikhail Sergeyevich burst out laughing—I wanted to know the diagnosis before the investigation had been completed.

I didn't manage to put my next question, the main one. [passage omitted]

...As far as my second question is concerned, it was as follows. After the CPSU Central Committee plenum members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau traveled to Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee leadership. And after they went home it was announced that they had met with complete understanding and support, including from Mikhail Sergeyevich. Is that the case or not?

I do not regret not putting the question. The situation has clarified of its own accord.

Cautions Against 'Rally-Type Passions'

LD1301150690 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT
13 Jan 90

["No Need to Disunite Party to Attain Perestroyka Goals"—TASS headline]

[Text] Vilnius January 13 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, when addressing the personnel of the television equipment plant in Shyaulay on Friday, called on people not to be in a hurry in tackling the problems of Soviet Federation, not to cut ropes in an off-hand manner and set out to sea without compass and weather data.

It is necessary to gain a good understanding of the situation to consider everything and determine what should be utilised and what should be discarded as premature and unripe, he said.

Gorbachev has been visiting in this Baltic republic since January 11 in accordance with the decision of the December (1989) Plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee.

Pointing to current deep processes taking place in Lithuania to reassess the entire past, Gorbachev cautioned against rally-type passions and epithets that are intended for the uninformed, and recalled the great strides made by the republic over the past 40 years.

The Soviet president believes that a consensus is now taking shape in the country as regards the realisation of the main thing: the need for revolutionary renewal of Soviet society. He declared for decentralisation of the economy and dismantling of the administrative-command system in the economic field.

Gorbachev described as a normal phenomenon the search being conducted by the Lithuanian Communist Party as regards various aspects of the national economy and cultural life, including matters concerning the future role of the party.

Perestroika found towns, work collectives and republics in various socio-economic, moral and psychological situation. Therefore different approaches and different tasks arise, he said.

When tackling problems within the framework of the realisation of the perestroika policy, Gorbachev emphasised, it is essential to take up a particularly responsible attitude. The turn being made now will change the Soviet Union completely and all forms of society's life.

These processes will accelerate and 1990 will become a decisive year and a year of crucial solutions in all aspects of political and economic reforms, including the Federation.

Gorbachev expressed his principled stand: In order to attain the goals of perestroika and renewal, there is no need to disunite the party or break up the Federation. He believes that within the framework of a new Federation it is necessary to attain genuine sovereignty, both political and economic.

At the same time the Soviet president spoke of the necessity to have a legal mechanism for the exercise of the constitutional rights of the republics to secession from the union.

A draft of such a law has already been elaborated and will soon be submitted to the commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, he said.

But a disruption of people-to-people, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, political, and party contacts would lead to the loss of at least 10-15 years and even to slipping down to the roadside of social progress, of history, Gorbachev reiterated.

'Useful' Visit

LD1401231790 Moscow in English to Africa
1700 GMT 14 Jan 90

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed confidence after returning to Moscow from Lithuania that the formula of a decision that will not damage the unity of the Soviet Communist Party will be found. The Soviet Party's Central Committee will resume its session to take part in the search.

The Soviet leader described his trip as useful, and pointed out that it would be followed by people across

the Soviet Union and all over the world. He urged the Lithuanian communists to continue the dialogue on the situation inside their party which, he said, has nationwide significance.

What proposals will be made on that issue will go before the forthcoming Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, which is to set a milestone in the ongoing reorganization of the party? The Soviet leader spoke out for more independence of the republican parties within the Soviet Party, for free advancement of the constituent republics within the Soviet federation, and for consolidating the healthy democratic forces of society on the platform of perestroika.

Lithuanian Official Views Gorbachev Visit

LD1301114590 Moscow World Service in English
0810 GMT 13 Jan 90

[(Algimantas Zukas) remarks recorded in vernacular, fading into English translation except where otherwise indicated]

[Text] [Announcer] President Mikhail Gorbachev is in Lithuania on a working visit, he is making the trip shortly after the Lithuanian Communist Party decided to break off with the national Communist Party, but some of its members said they wanted to remain within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Besides an overwhelming majority of the Lithuanian people support the idea of their republic's secession from the USSR. In the course of his visit Mikhail Gorbachev has been meeting workers and intellectuals and talking to people in the streets. How is the dialogue proceeding, and are those taking part willing to understand each other? We have put these and other questions by telephone to a representative of the independent Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, (Algimantas Zhukas):

[(Zhukas) remarks, read by second announcer] The political situation is stable enough because nobody wants serious confrontation. Local people have extended a friendly and interested reception to the guest from Moscow because this is the first visit to Lithuania by a head of state and the Communist Party over the past 50 years. Spontaneous discussions in the streets and squares have been vigorous on both sides and I wouldn't say, (Algimantas Zhukas) remarks, that the two sides have proved able to come to terms at once.

[Announcer] President Gorbachev has had a number of meetings with labor staffs. He spoke to an audience of Lithuanian intellectuals at the Press House; there were many other meetings. One cannot say though that all speakers, and there were quite a few of them, were convincing and articulate enough in explaining their position. Some of the arguments were controversial and others simply naive, for instance claims that Lithuania would gain a great deal in economic terms in case of leaving the USSR. A great assembly of Lithuania's residents was timed to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit in Vilnius, its main message was that Lithuania must be

free. According to some sources nearly 800,000 people gathered in the city to take part in rallies in the city's central square and main streets. In the evening there was a church service, church bells rang and people holding candles joined hands to form a live chain. How united are the republic's residents on the issue of independence? (Algimantas Zukas):

[(Zukas)] It's hard to say that everybody has the same idea of how independence can be achieved and agrees with the way the problem has been formulated. Apparently one must take into account the decision of the Popular Front in neighboring Estonia. The issue of sovereignty there holds 14th place on the list of priority objectives facing Estonia that would allow the republic to raise to a qualitatively new level of statehood.

[Announcer] How convincing did you find the arguments in favor of a new type of federation and the possibility of overcoming political, economic, and other problems together within the federation?

[(Zukas)] In principle this can be expected, but first everybody must know that it is all about.

[Announcer] What kind of relations the two Communist Parties in Lithuania will have in the future?

[(Zukas)] There will be a fullscale joint meeting of their Central Committee on Saturday and it will discuss future relations and consider the immediate steps.

[Announcer] Do you expect any kind of pressure, bearing in mind the sad experience of the previous years?

[(Zukas)] I know that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, when he was in the United States, said that no power politics will be used against the Baltic republics. Besides, the political situation itself has been changing. The main result is that at the current stage of society's development force, tanks, won't settle anything.

[Announcer] Lithuania has been holding regular opinion polls to test the popularity of politicians. Who is in the lead now? (Algimantas Zukas), representing the independent Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, had this to say:

[(Zukas)] We are glad about the fact that the Communist Party of Lithuania for the first time has a higher rating than the Sajudis movement, the Lithuanian Popular Front. The rating of the first secretary of the independent Central Committee Brazauskas is out of reach. One must also add that all those who follow him on the list are secretaries of the independent Central Committee, his supporters.

Significance of Gorbachev Lithuania Trip Viewed

PM1601155190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 16 Jan 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by S. Balyutskiy: "Let Us Think About It Together. Lithuania Following the Visit by the CPSU Central Committee Team"]

[Text] Vilnius—It would be right to call this period an historic one. Historic not because it was the first time a CPSU Central Committee general secretary had been to the republic. But chiefly because the circumstances that dictated his visit are directly linked to the future not only of the republic, but of the Union as a whole.

"We ask you to understand us, not suppress us"—this was the inscription on a banner that was on display during M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with farmers. I think the banner was superfluous. I would say that the desire to understand was the leitmotiv of the visits. But also to present arguments and a vision of the issue in the context of perestroika countrywide.

"But I was not entirely satisfied that you were trying your best to put across your viewpoint. I was saying: Let us think about it," M.S. Gorbachev said on the final day of the visit.

But the other side was not satisfied either, on occasions. "It seems to me that neither side was particularly keen to listen to arguments. Although, of course, the meeting was definitely useful. I think both sides now understand one another better," this was Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee Secretary Yu. Paletskis' description for a TIESA correspondent of M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the creative intelligentsia.

What is the matter? I think it is due to different ideas about the republic's future development. Which is what M.S. Gorbachev said in his speech at the party-economic aktiv meeting. The CPSU regards it as a matter of improving the Soviet federation and filling it with real substance. "We need the federation as socialism's second wind," Mikhail Sergeyevich said.

But the LCP leaders regard this path as unacceptable. They state in their program that only in an independent Lithuanian state is it possible to build a democratic society in which the basic humanitarian ideals of socialism are implemented.

It was the view of the future development of the federation and the republic that appeared to be the stumbling block as far as the sides' arguments were concerned. Here, for example, is what G. Rinkyavichyus, chief conductor and artistic director of the Youth Symphony Orchestra, said: "The conversation during M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with the creative intelligentsia did not persuade me that we should not go for independence. Need one argue why a person should be free?"

Indeed, one need not argue that every person wants to be free. But one must argue about the degree of mutual

dependence one cannot do without today. M.S. Gorbachev presented a whole series of arguments in favor of the republics' most democratic interdependence within the federation. In my view, the counterarguments in favor of the republic's secession were not as comprehensive and not as persuasive. Above all, most of the arguments did not properly take into account the totality of the interests of the main protagonist—the working person. I believe that Mikhail Sergeyevich had this in mind when he talked about the “academic constructs” that are being imposed on real life.

“Will Lithuania be free if it severs established economic links with the other republics of the USSR?”—this was the refrain of the majority of speeches both by M.S. Gorbachev and by the members of the CPSU Central Committee team. “But we do not want to sever economic ties,” they insisted in reply.

But they had clearly forgotten that most of these ties are tightly interwoven and have even become intertwined with political ties.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's stay in the republic has ended. What did it achieve? Without claiming to be exhaustive—it is too soon after the end of the visit—I would single out, above all, that which is attracting attention here, on the spot.

First, the CPSU Central Committee plenum instruction to study the situation in the republic as thoroughly and as comprehensively as possible was carried out 100 percent, I believe. M.S. Gorbachev and the members of the Central Committee team visited 15 rayons and 40 labor collectives.

Second, the republic's inhabitants also obtained firsthand information. Different, often diametrically opposite interpretations of the opinion of the Politburo and CPSU Central Committee on the “Lithuanian issue”—as M.S. Gorbachev called it—in the republican and central press had made people very confused. Although all the meetings and gatherings were as democratic as possible, there being no wish to impose a point of view, the attitude of the Politburo and M.S. Gorbachev personally on the basic aspects of the political situation was pretty definite.

Third (and this is very important), M.S. Gorbachev's stay in the republic and his meetings at labor collectives and on the street greatly defused the situation. One part of the population felt sure that irrespective of the republic's future development, even if it leaves the USSR, force will not be used. The other part, which is not in favor of Lithuania's leaving the Union, is now confident that its social and economic rights will be protected in that event.

“We are confident that the law on secession from the USSR, which M.S. Gorbachev said was being elaborated, will provide real guarantees of the protection of our interests,” V. Pavlovich, a fitter at the “Vilma” production association, said.

Have the positions of the two Communist Party Central Committees changed at all? So far, no. “We will not be changing our positions, of course,” A. Matulyavichs, member of the Central Committee of the independent LCP, said. “The exchange of opinions has not altered our position” A. Golozov, member of the provisional Central Committee of the LCP (on the CPSU platform) said. Indeed, serious decisions—and what could be more serious than the decisions of the 20th LCP Congress—cannot be changed overnight.

Professor Yu. Yermolavichyus reckons: “I believe the visit will make many people, in particular the intelligentsia, review their positions.”

One would like to see this happen. Indeed, both sides in a society that is still severely polarized must review their positions. After all, neither envisages the republic developing without having links with the union. It is just that some see them as close—federative—and others see them as less close. No one knows what they will actually be like.

One thing is clear: The building of a new society and new relations with neighbors should be carried out on the basis of real life, not on the basis of a lifeless construct, an abstract ideal. I believe all the participants in the recent “political marathon” would endorse this thesis. Does it not present an opportunity to bring them closer together?

Possible Lithuanian Secession Discussed

Would Need Referendum

PM1201130990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Morning Edition pp 1,2

[Own correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy report: “Lithuania: To Reckon or Be Reckoned With?”]

[Excerpt] On 10 January V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (CPSU platform); and V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of the Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Oblast Party Committee, met in the “Pyargale” (“Pobeda”) Collective Farm Club with its working people and representatives of other economic units in the Vilnyuskiy Rayon.

The third day of work by the CPSU Central Committee commission in Lithuania perhaps proved to be the fullest and most intensive. Judge for yourselves: At one and the same time, V.A. Medvedev had a meeting with working people in Vilnyuskiy Rayon, while Yu.D. Maslyukov was meeting with workers from the “Sigma” Association, where the positions of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party are particularly strong, followed by a rally at midday in Cathedral Square in Vilnius organized by “Sajudis.” Its slogan was written on a banner above

the rostrum: "Freedom and Independence for Lithuania." This was followed by an address by Ye.P. Velikhov, B.I. Oleynik, and M.A. Ulyanov at the Academy of Sciences, a news conference by the leader of "Sajudis," V. Landsbergis, on the mass events held by the movement in the last few days, and then more meetings with workers, students, economists, and members of the republic's Council of Ministers....

Every one of these events represents a step toward mutual understanding—a steep, difficult step, in my view. It has been gratifying to see the constructive approach to resolving problems among business people: leaders of the republic's industrial enterprises, economists, and managers.

"Where has the idea come from that Lithuania intends to sever economic ties with the USSR? This dishonest version of events is being repeated by the central press, thereby complicating what are already the difficult first steps toward economic independence. We want exactly the opposite: we want to broaden and strengthen economic ties with the union as much as possible," the director of one of these enterprises exclaimed.

Indeed, who is the author of this story? Where has it come from? This is a subject for some very interesting research. I personally have not read any inflammatory articles in the central press about breaking off economic ties with Lithuania....

Economics and politics are two sides of the same coin. So, having paid due attention to the political analysis of the situation in previous reports, it would be interesting to consider the Lithuanian Communist Party decision on self-determination from an economic standpoint.

In this respect, the meetings and conversations which Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has had with the people of the republic are of particular interest. I would describe Yuriy Dmitriyevich's speeches and conversations as unusual and original for a statesman of his rank. Let me give you an example. At the radio-measuring instruments plant club he was asked about the conflict along the Azerbaijan section of the Iranian border. The person who asked the question was indignant about the outrages. The audience was in solidarity with him. And when Yu.D. Maslyukov began to assess the conflict without the harsh, threatening tone usual in such cases, someone in the audience muttered: They should be shot.

"Shot?" Yuriy Dmitriyevich repeated the question. "Surely we cannot open fire on unarmed people? And is all the damage really worth even one human life? Surely we are not such barbarians?"

This is exactly what is happening now, I think to myself, with feelings in Lithuania running high because of great ideas that are being weighed on a large pair of geopolitical scales, on which the cost of one life, one individual

is unnoticeable. It seems to be taken for granted that one life—or several lives—can perfectly well be sacrificed for the sake of a great, brilliant idea.

The radio-measuring instruments plant was at the end of the list of enterprises visited by the CPSU Central Committee commission and was the last of 30. Consequently, during his conversation with the workers Yu.D. Maslyukov had already stored up a long list of observations and impressions. He noted the well organized production, the modern technology, and the similarity between people's fears and concerns, demands and suggestions.

We will not dwell on the questions and answers during Yu.D. Maslyukov's meetings on the shop floor of the radio-measuring instruments plant. It is an ordinary, Russian-speaking enterprise with the usual concerns and problems.

"The Lithuanians have no other land," Yu.D. Maslyukov said. "Their roots are here and their moral and historical values. It goes without saying that you have to know the language and the culture of the people among whom you are living.... Naturally, the Lithuanians themselves have a right to decide their own future: whether to stay in the USSR or secede. As far as we are concerned, formulating the issue in this way is usually purely theoretical. But world practice is familiar with examples of this kind. Our stand is that secession from the USSR is possible. But, in this respect, the interests of citizens who do not agree with this decision of the Lithuanian people must not suffer."

It is hard not to agree with Yu.D. Maslyukov: A considerable proportion of those supporting Lithuanian self-determination outside the framework of the USSR have spoken in favor of it as an idea that, although dear to the heart, is nevertheless abstract. This is not without the influence of agitation at rallies, of which it would be hard to expect very profound economic analysis, because these rallies have a different purpose.... But it is hard not to agree that the people must clearly visualize and soberly consider not only where they are coming from but also where they are going and what that will cost.

There is no doubt that the chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers is precisely the person who knows the cost of such a step, and there is no harm in listening to what he has to say. Here are just a few of the questions that arise: In half a century of joint coexistence, a considerable number of material assets have been accumulated: So what is going to become of them? Who is going to create jobs for emigrants? And build housing?

The USSR Supreme Soviet is currently working on a draft law on the order and procedure for seceding from the USSR. All questions and conditions must be covered by this law, because this kind of step can only be based on the letter and spirit of the law.

Yu.D. Maslyukov emphasized: It is hard to imagine that the collective mind of the nation will be able to decide on taking this step. It would have serious consequences not only for the great country that is the Soviet Union, but primarily for Lithuania itself. Consequently, the decision to secede can only be taken by a national referendum. It can only be taken with a poll to establish the opinion of every member of the population, and this poll would have to be preceded by an honest explanation of the consequences of this step. He quoted figures. Lithuania currently imports goods and material resources worth R7.5 billion and exports goods and material resources worth R6 billion. The shortfall of R1.5 billion will be increased by R1.8 billion after the introduction of new prices. Any schoolchild can divide just over R3 billion by just over 3 million inhabitants of the republic. It is a fact that people must be aware of this burden, because the only option that any state has to secure these resources is to obtain them from its citizens.

I have seen more than once how people in the republic react painfully to detached discussions about how much freedom could cost them in rubles or freely convertible currency. And evidently they are right: It is up to them to determine their future and count the costs.

If we return to the conference of directors at the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, the criticism addressed to the central press could be continued as follows: We have not learned to think clearly and have not taught our readers to do so either. Primitivism in our elucidation of friendship between peoples and of internationalism is not the least reason for the appearance of total parasitism. So, Lithuania is making the transition to economic independence. The first timid steps really are being made with difficulty. Worrying examples of this were given at the meeting between the chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee and enterprise directors: an enterprise without metal, timber failing to be delivered, a mill on starvation rations, with no cotton. And what kind of requests are being made to the top leaders? The request to force partners to honor their commitments. Some leaders see a covert economic blockade behind Lithuania's difficult material position. It is a secret to no one that, given the general shortage of commodity resources, any supplier would have no difficulty in refuting this accusation, but.... But the idea is still there, nevertheless, at the back of people's minds: What if we were to ask, to put the pressure on—would it suddenly have an effect?

Friendship, unity, mutual assistance: These are not just agitation slogans. They also appear to have an economic aspect. And if the seeds of discord should fly to some timber-felling area in the taiga or to blackly smoking open-hearth furnaces, people in Lithuania could not be blamed for wondering by what wind and from where these seeds were carried there? Discord not only causes a deterioration in the moral climate, it also hits the ruble hard. It is difficult not to agree with the chairman of the

USSR State Planning Committee: Examples of deliberate non-deliver must be punished mercilessly and irrevocably. This does not restore friendship but inflames hatred.

Does all this have any bearing on the Lithuanian Communist Party split? Everyone should try to answer this question for himself. It would be good if this answer were not black and white—a straight yes or no—because life itself is not black and white. The independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, approved by the overwhelming majority of the republic's communists, cannot be regarded as an emotional outburst. This determined step is a mirror reflection of the Lithuanian people's outlook and aspirations. We can agree or disagree with it, but we must treat this decision with respect. In my view, this mutual respect is being demonstrated these days by the CPSU Central Committee commission. [passage omitted]

'Blow to Political Reform'

LD1301132190 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT
13 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius January 13 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Yuriy Sizov:

Democratisation, glasnost and renewal of all sides of the life of Lithuanian society have led to the polarisation of public opinion and political forces, split the 200,000-strong party organisation of this Baltic republic. The break of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU), finalised by decisions of the 20th Congress of Lithuanian Communists, has dealt a blow to political reform, hopes and plans to renew socialist society in the spirit of humanism and democracy.

Keen discussions on ways to develop the Communist Party of Lithuania, in which Mikhail Gorbachev is taking part these days, will be continued today at a meeting with the party activists of the republic.

The meeting will be attended both by representatives of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania, which broke from the CPSU, and the communists who come out in favour of preserving the unity of party ranks. As Gorbachev told a meeting with workers, the united CPSU is the integrating force of society which should understand all the processes of perestroika, unite the interests of people in attaining its goals.

Analysing causes which have led to the split of Lithuanian communists and rising separatist feelings in the republic, political news analysts agree that the activity of the pro-perestroika public movement, Sajudis, played a key role in this. Suffice it to recall that Sajudis leaders called during two years for breaking from the CPSU, discussed the possibility of liquidating the Communist Party of Lithuania and favoured Lithuania's secession.

Realistically assessing the situation, Sajudis leaders effectively and purposefully worked in party organisations. Sajudis began to merge with the party, or rather with its apparatus and elective bodies.

The more it merged with the party the stronger was its influence on it.

It was not accidental that half of members of the Central committee and the Central Committee Bureau of the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania had earlier been elected to Sajudis elective bodies and actively worked in them.

The next day after the congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party ended its work one of Sajudis leaders, Juozaitis, said that the 20th party congress "has brought Sajudis real power and the communist party leadership has begun to implement its policy tasks."

However, far from all party members consider the decisions of the 20th congress well-balanced and solely correct. Stanislava Juonene, member of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), told TASS that the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania "cannot be described as a party of communists because its programme and rules break away from the ideological and political principles of the Marxist-Leninist party."

Juozas Kuolialis, secretary of the Provisional Central Committee, said more than 50,000 Lithuanian Communists, or almost 25 percent of the republican party organisation, share this view.

"The number of supporters of a well-balanced and realistic policy is growing despite the moral terror and pressure on them in conditions of the increasing nationalist sentiments in Lithuanian society," he said.

The Soviet leader's frank conversations in Lithuania show that the struggle of ideas is won by the truth. Gorbachev's arguments in favour of a united Soviet communist Party and Soviet Federation often put his opponents in a fix.

The country has embarked the road of profound changes. It now needs understanding, analysis, restraint and tolerance, and the Soviet leader's efforts are aimed at achieving political compromises, including in Lithuania.

Sajudis Rejects Secession Law Initiative

LD1501221490 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Jan 90

[Text] The Council of the Sajudis Seimas has adopted a statement at its meeting on the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Lithuania. The statement was issued because Mr Gorbachev put forward an initiative on working out a legal mechanism on seceding from the Soviet Union. The Sajudis statement says that the law on leaving the

Soviet Union, proposed by the Soviet leader, was basically unacceptable to the Lithuanian people. First of all, Lithuania has been annexed. Next [words indistinct] the right of the people to self-determination. The principle of self-determination was applied to the people of Lithuania on 12th July, 1920. (?By) the Russian-Lithuanian peace treaty. The future inter-state cooperation between Lithuania and the Soviet Union should be based on this treaty. According to Arvydas Juozaitis, the statement of the Sajudis Seimas Council is aimed at the future as well.

[Begin Arvydas Juozaitis recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation] Everything that is happening here in Lithuania, and especially the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, is a sign of the political power of Lithuania growing stronger with each day. And it is all very well that out of the whole of the Soviet Union, which is at present in the state of chaos, a certain point has been localized, and this point is Lithuania. Nothing can be based on personal ambition, interests, or wishes. Everything must be based on certain theses, understandable and acceptable as the norms of international politics. The law on secession is an initiative put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev. However, we cannot compromise on this issue. We have a very specific historical background. [end recording]

Sajudis Official Comments

AU1501153390 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 13-14 Jan 90 p 3

["mas" report on interview with Virgil Cepaytis, secretary general of the Lithuanian Sajudis movement: "Lithuanian Popular Front Against Secession Law"—in Vienna, date not given]

[Excerpt] Vienna—The answer of the Lithuanian popular front "Sajudis" to Gorbachev's proposal of a so-called "secession law" for all 15 Soviet republics is a clear "no."

"Such a law might be applied to certain USSR republics, such as the Ukraine, Belorussia, or Georgia, which are part of the USSR. However, Lithuania and the other Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia, have been occupied by the Soviet Army—they are occupied countries, Virgil Cepaytis, general secretary of Sajudis told DER STANDARD, thus explaining the nationalists' position. [passage omitted]

Brazauskas Comments on Talks With Gorbachev

Visit Clarified Positions

LD1701100890 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Excerpts] The newly elected chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Algirdas Brazauskas, gave his first press

conference as head of state at the headquarters of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee this afternoon.

Supporting his statement by reference to the amendment to Article 6 of the Constitution, Algirdas said that his title should now be confined only to head of the republic and that his duties as first secretary of the LCP should not be mentioned. [passage omitted]

"Algirdas Brazauskas said that his new post brings him even greater responsibility especially bearing in mind that a considerable part of the people of Lithuania do not support the combining of party and government posts. However, it must be admitted that the LCP is no longer the party which often duplicated the work of Parliament, said Algirdas Brazauskas. He said that at least for the moment he will give priority to his work in Parliament; the party duties will be made considerably easier for him by the new Central Committee bureau." [passage omitted]

"Algirdas Brazauskas also spoke about the telephone call from Gorbachev. The Soviet leader congratulated him on his new post and asked: Can we cooperate? Brazauskas replied: Yes, with great pleasure."

When the name of Gorbachev was mentioned the journalists asked if Gorbachev's visit brought our main goal—independence—any nearer. "Before answering this question much time should be spent on defining the concept of independence, Brazauskas answered. Independence is achieved in stages and these are very numerous. The implementation of these stages should be the work of the Lithuanian Parliament."

According to Brazauskas, Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania has not changed the course of events in Lithuania. The main objective of the visit was to clarify positions and to try to find compromises.

In a few sentences Brazauskas described Gorbachev's meeting with high-ranking military men of the Baltic military region in which Brazauskas also participated. He said that the meeting was not an easy one and Lithuania was heaped with reproaches on rather old facts. For example, they expressed indignation that the tank "Josef Stalin" had been removed from its plinth in Kaunas.

Brazauskas said that on one question there was agreement with the military: The status of the Soviet troops stationed in the union republics, and especially in the Baltic republics, should be defined by law. [passage omitted]

"When asked about the depolitization of various state institutions, Brazauskas pointed out that this process should be regulated by the law on parties which is to be formulated."

In conclusion, as if by prior agreement, the journalists called Brazauskas the president of Lithuania. The new

leader of the republic reminded them that his title is chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania.

Views 'Political Lesson'

LD1601212790 Moscow TASS in English 2116 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Vilnius January 16 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania has taught a political lesson, believes Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

Brazauskas addressed on Monday a news conference devoted to the results of the latest session of the Republic's Supreme Soviet and was asked by reporters to state his attitude to Gorbachev's visit.

Brazauskas was elected by the session president of the Presidium of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet.

Brazauskas said that during the visit Gorbachev and participants in the plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee were able to see what the Lithuanian people wants.

But the arguments stated to the guests at different levels could have been weightier, Brazauskas holds.

Brazauskas said that the visit has not changed the aims of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Its status, programme and other documents adopted by the 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party remain valid.

Brazauskas said that relations between the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party should be changing. The Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party is preparing a package of proposals about the relations between the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party. Brazauskas believes that the 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party should be convened earlier than planned.

Medvedev Holds Press Conference in Vilnius

LD1401111690 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1835 GMT 13 Jan 90

[Press conference held by Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in Vilnius on 13 January—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The results of the stay by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other participants in the CPSU Central Committee plenum were summed up at a news-conference for Soviet and foreign journalists in Vilnius today. Comrades Medvedev, Maslyukov, Frolov, and others took part in it.

Opening the news conference, Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev said:

[Medvedev] I would like to say that it was an essentially unprecedented dialogue which took place between the leadership of our country, party leader, and the Lithuanian public. The comrades, who arrived from Moscow and our country's other republics, oblasts, and towns, visited 15 towns and rayons in the republic and over 40 organizations and works collectives, including some of the biggest production, scientific, and academic organizations, and met there with figures in literature and the arts. All this was widely covered in the press, on television, and on radio. So there was a unique opportunity for an exchange of opinions on the situation in the republic, on questions of the country's socio-political development, and on problems of perestroika and prospects for its further development and deepening.

What can one briefly say about it? The republic is, generally, living a normal working life, the main branches of the national economy—industry and agriculture—are working quite well, although they still have their problems. But, of course, the republic's socio-political life has now been set alight by the main event of the past year: The 20th congress of the republican Communist Party. Its decisions had great repercussions both within the republic and outside its boundaries. This, strictly speaking, was the subject of our discussions here. They were difficult discussions, impartial and open discussions; none concealed his opinions, positions, and convictions, neither those who took part in the meetings and conversations from among the party workers, nor from the aktiv, nor from among the working people, nor the citizens, nor those of us who had instructions from the party Central Committee.

All kinds of opinions were expressed about the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. We tried to elucidate and put forward the arguments, appraisals, and conclusions made in Comrade Gorbachev's report at the December party Central Committee plenum and to somehow explain them and to add more specific opinions and material to them. Other points of view were made to us, and why should one conceal anything? The predominant point of view was that in which support was expressed for the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party, as a step which somehow results from the whole logic of events and is necessary for the republic's Communists for its further development along the path of perestroika. I must say frankly that this businesslike discussion and interesting dialogue was in many instances not helped by, on the contrary was hindered by, emotions and explosions of feeling and the effusion of it, and declarations which, as it were, could also be responded to with the same emotional reaction, the same explosions of feeling and the same declarations. We did not want to do that, and we wanted to switch the discussions precisely onto a plane of pithy discussion of the problems which had arisen.

But, of course, this was not the only point of view we heard. We heard another point of view, too, that of those who remained on the CPSU platform, who do not agree

with the 20th congress decisions and who consider them to be both a retreat from the positions of perestroika and, let us be blunt, a blow to the policy of perestroika and to the positions of the party and our leadership. This was demonstrated in many—in a number—of production collectives and in other instances at meetings in many party committees. For our part, we had the opportunity, as I have already said, to give a summary account of our own point of view. This was put in a more detailed and more emotional and pithy way by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his speeches at the fuel apparatus works, at the meeting with the republic's creative and scientific intelligentsia, at the meetings at the television works in Siauliai and at today's final meeting in the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, at the aktiv.

We understand the situation in the republic and we are taking away with us the whole spectrum of moods and opinions which exist here, including that which takes the course of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. However, we are also taking away with us a realization of the degree of anxiety and alarm among a considerable section of the Lithuanian population about the course of the further development of events. We are taking away with us the assurance of virtually everyone, without exception, whom we came across, that they support the policy of perestroika, with this reservation or that, with this understanding or that of this process. We are taking away with us—and I can speak about this as one who has seen the meetings in the streets, and you, I think, will confirm this—an understanding of the great prestige enjoyed by our leadership, and by Comrade Gorbachev among the Lithuanian people. I must say the dialogue which has taken place here will be continued. An exchange of opinions is necessary, an exchange of opinions which is sensible, reasonable, fundamental, and as free as possible from emotions because in this instance they are not the best aide. The dialogue will be continued to find a constructive solution to the situation which has arisen, and to present to the Central Committee plenum, when it resumes its debate on this issue, those proposals which correspond to the real situation in the country and the republic, and take into account the moods of the people, but at the same time preserve our fundamental positions.

[Announcer] The participants in the news conference replied to numerous questions asked by journalists.

[Correspondent Maria Huber] Maria Huber, DIE ZEIT and DIE WELTWOCH; this is my question: Lithuania is now at the center of attention, but other republics, autonomous republics, and even regions such as the Kuzbass are complaining about the diktat of the center, that nothing has changed so far in the diktat of the Council of Ministers and Gosplan. This question is for Comrade Maslyukov: What conclusions will you personally draw after this trip to Lithuania?

[Maslyukov] At the meeting at the Council of Ministers there was a kind of collision when speakers demanded

complete independence, on the one hand, in the sale of products. In other words, every enterprise spoke in favor of that enterprise independently remaining the owner of production, in other words, of it fully owning the results of its work. That, so to speak, is in accordance with what I, too, think.

At the same time, however, all the enterprises and producers' associations all raised the issue of the union taking upon itself—that is, the center under whose diktat these enterprises now find themselves—of the center taking upon itself the full, 100-percent provision of raw materials. The provision of raw materials: What is involved here is metal, cement, timber, and, well, all the rest of it, including the supply of equipment in sets.

Well, you yourselves understand this is impossible when market relations are being organized. I understand very well the wish of those who want that independence, and a gradual transition to market relations in 1991-1992, except for certain strategic issues of the country's development, is in fact envisioned in our economic program. For this reason, I also favor independence and favor this diktat of the center being reduced only to the resolution of national tasks of the Soviet Union. However, I favor a gradual transition to that system because both the enterprises and the center are simply not yet prepared for it. To do this it is necessary to go through certain steps. The experience of 1990 will show us the rate at which we can approach it. Thank you.

[Unidentified U.S. journalist, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] For Mr Medvedev: You said that you came away with the impression that many people here support the decision of the 20th Lithuanian Congress, and also support perestroika. Does that mean that you no longer believe that the decision of the 20th congress is a blow to perestroika?

[Medvedev] Look, any issue must be approached in a concrete manner. The Lithuanian comrades have put the issue to us in approximately the same form during conversations, meetings, and discussions: They said that the process of perestroika is taking place in Lithuania. Apparently it is taking place even more rapidly than in the country as a whole. How, then, they ask us, do you say that the 20th congress, which actually arose on a wave of perestroika, represents a blow to perestroika?

I will not say that everything contained in the new Statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania deserves to be assessed negatively. There are also points which will probably be taken into account in the future in the rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a whole. In other words, they move in the direction of the general processes of democratization of the party and of perestroika. This cannot be denied. However, nor can it be denied that this step in itself is linked to the de facto withdrawal of one of the republican communist parties from the composition of the CPSU, or that it helps perestroika in the country, because it weakens the Union, it weakens the party's position, and it weakens

the leadership's position. [sentence as heard] It stimulates the activity of conservative forces, which present a very simple argument: This is where matters have ended up, they say; this is what the current policy of the current party leadership has brought the country to—disintegration.

International positions, too, are being undermined and weakened. I think that it is not for me to tell you about the close, and I would even say, intense attention, with which they are watching abroad, both in Europe, and not only in Europe, to see how the further development of events will progress. Will the Soviet leadership be able to master the situation, and to maintain it? This is, after all, an indispensable condition for moving along the path of perestroika.

[Studio announcer] Answers were also given to other questions from journalists.

Vilnius Radio Blasts Gerasimov Remarks on Lithuania

*LD1401120690 Vilnius in English to North America
2300 GMT 13 Jan 90*

[Excerpts] Of the two press conferences that I attended yesterday, the first was a businesslike discussion of the economic issues that Lithuania is going to face in conditions of self-government and prospective full independence. The second was a practice in pointed questions and sharp witticism on the part of the journalists and a model lesson of how to talk much without saying anything on the part of Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who was answering the questions. [passage omitted]

Very little can be said about what Gennadiy Gerasimov released to journalists in his press conference. All answers were either negative or evasive and the most valuable bit of information about Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the north Lithuanian city of Shyaulay was surprisingly about much earlier times.

It was made public that in their student days Mikhail Gorbachev and the Lithuanian leader, Algirdas Brazauskas, had lived in the same students' hostel—true, on different floors. I wonder if that was meant to convey that we should continue extolling the USSR is our common home theory, so popular in the strong center now, yet losing its charm in some of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union, Lithuania included.

Lithuanian Press Official on Access to Gorbachev

*LD1201125590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1100 GMT 12 Jan 90*

[From the Press Review presented by Algis Usas]

[Text] Yesterday when we were preparing for the relay of the rally in Cathedral Square our listeners kept calling and asking why we were saying nothing about the visit of M. Gorbachev, and why there were no live broadcasts.

Well, I believe that you got the idea from what press spokesman Gerasimov said at the news conference late yesterday evening, which was also broadcast by our television. Journalists from the republic and those from abroad are simply not allowed access to Gorbachev wherever he goes. A special group which arrived from Moscow does the coverage. Here is what I would call authoritative confirmation of what I said by Rimgaudas Eilunavicius, chief of the press center, who is speaking on the telephone:

[Begin recording] [Eilunavicius] The team that arrived from Moscow most probably had special instructions not to give foreign journalists access and also to restrict the number of journalists from Lithuania who would have the right to be rather nearer Gorbachev. So, they are acting in accordance with instructions.

[Usas] Yes, probably we are encountering a situation of this sort for the first time?

[Eilunavicius] That's right. It is the first time that we have found ourselves in such a situation.

[Usas] Could we predict that such a thing could happen?

[Eilunavicius] Well, maybe this is really my fault. It had never occurred to me, and then it was too late to take any measures against this.

[Usas] Yet, what specific facts can you give to us to substantiate this claim?

[Eilunavicius] I do not see there is any need for any specific facts. Yesterday Gerasimov said this straight out at the news conference.

[Usas] We also saw the expression on his face, which was very interesting.

[Eilunavicius] Yes, yes, that's right.

[Usas] What is the situation today at the press center?

[Eilunavicius] Today, at 1300 GMT there will be a briefing with representatives of the Communist Party of Lithuania in the CPSU platform.

[Usas] Journalists are expecting it, aren't they?

[Eilunavicius] Oh, yes. Of course they are expecting news from Siauliai as well. We expect that news will come in from Siauliai by telephone. We will inform them about events taking place there. Of course, they are interested in the briefing with Kazimiera Prunskiene and a couple of U.S. economists who visiting this republic. The briefing will take place at 1700 GMT. [end recording]

Radio Carries Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session

0900 GMT 15 Jan

LD1501104790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 15 January begins carrying a live

relay of the 16th Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

Lionginas Sepetys, who is chairing the session, begins by announcing that according to the data on deputies registration, 268 deputies are present.

Following this, the agenda is announced as follows:

"1. Statement by the chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Vytautas Astrauskas.

"2. Announcer of a referendum on the right of servicemen who do not permanently reside in the republic to vote in elections of deputies to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and local soviets.

"3. Confirmation of decrees of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and adoption of Supreme Soviet decisions.

"4. Stopping the validity of the decision by the USSR Council of Ministers of 4 January 1990 on the handing over of the USSR Savings Bank to the USSR State Bank.

"5. On stopping the validity of the USSR law on constitutional supervision in the union." 258 deputies vote for the adoption of this agenda.

Lionginas Sepetys says that the session could be concluded today and all questions should be resolved.

At 0910 GMT, the floor is given to Vytautas Astrauskas.

Vytautas Astrauskas says that he has always attempted to do well, sometimes in very difficult conditions. He loves Lithuania, supports its regeneration, and expresses his regrets that sometimes his work has not been as good as he would have liked it to be. He asked to be relieved from his duties and proposes that Algirdas Brazauskas be elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

At 0918 GMT, Deputy (Ratkevicius) says that this is not the right time to change the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Instead everybody should be getting ready for the plenum in Moscow.

At 0924 GMT, Deputy (Rusteika) backs the former speaker saying that the resignation of V. Astrauskas would serve as confirmation of the claims made in Moscow that, allegedly, neither the chairman of the Supreme Soviet nor the chairman of the Council of Ministers is able to work because of the current political situation in the republic. The deputy adds that this should not be allowed to happen and Comrade Astrauskas should remain in office for the 2 remaining months.

At 0926 GMT, Deputy Jucius voices the opinion that Vytautas Astrauskas should be allowed to resign, because in 2 months time he will not be reelected. He proposes Algirdas Brazauskas to the post.

At 0930 GMT, Deputy (Kardauskas) expresses gratitude to V. Brazauskas for his good work in the past and supports the idea that Astrauskas resign and Brazauskas be elected chairman.

At 0932 GMT, Deputy Stakvilevicius explains the situation at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies where V. Astrauskas was not able to take up his place at the presidium because he simply was not an elected people's deputy.

At 0940 GMT, Deputies vote on the resignation of Astrauskas: 218 deputies vote in favor of the resignation and 13 vote against. Thus, the resignation of Astrauskas is accepted. The chairman of the session thanked him. Flowers are presented to Astrauskas to applause.

At 0947 GMT, debate on the candidates for the post of chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet begin.

At 0950 GMT, Deputy Juksyte proposes Kazimieras Motieka to the post. At 0952 GMT, Deputy Statulavicius supports the proposal. Deputy Bernotas then speaks in support of A. Brazauskas. At 0955 GMT, an unidentified deputy proposes Romualdas Ozolas for the post. Other deputies advance various proposals for the post.

At 1006 GMT, voting on the proposed candidates begins. At 1010 GMT, the result is announced as follows:

Algirdas Brazauskas: 228 deputies in favor, 4 against, 19 abstained. Thus, Algirdas Brazauskas is elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR.

1017 GMT

LD1501115490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 1017 GMT on 15 January continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

At this time, Brazauskas takes the floor and says:

"I wish to say that the Lithuanian Communist Party is a normal political party, which must endeavor to implement its adopted program, maybe enrich it, so that the Lithuanian people, the Lithuanian nation, and other nations living in Lithuania—not only communists—support us and understand our ideas and our wishes to be together with Lithuania, with Lithuania's people. Thus the conclusion follows that the Lithuanian Communist Party no longer fulfills functions which it used to fulfill not long ago, 1, or 1 and 1/2 years ago.

"We are living in a very complicated period, a transitional period, until a new party and new political and economic structures are established. We will have to pass many laws, above all, those laws which will legalize our economic independence. Without it, our train cannot move forward; and this work has only started.

"How we arrange our live in the future depends on us, on us in this hall, on us who watch on television," Brazauskas continues.

"The visit of Comrade Gorbachev and of a large group of party workers has ended. We hope Comrade Gorbachev and others gained a good impression of Lithuania, of its country and its people, but [word indistinct] these impressions were varied and opinions were varied. Problems and a collision have occurred in the country's party political life for the first time. This has not yet ended. On 29 January there will be a plenum which will attempt to adopt, or will adopt, a decision concerning us. But our program and our regulations are operating: new party organizations are being formed. The path of this progress cannot be blocked and there is no need to do so. Our documents are in force and are being implemented. Thus there is a great deal to accomplish.

"Although the law has been passed, its implementation is very slow, and very often we have to overcome serious obstacles, both in the legal sense, and also in the lack of willingness of some central organization to solve problems.

"I imagine that the chairman's primary duty today is to concentrate the efforts of our government, the Council of Ministers, of course the Supreme Soviet, to use everything, all this arsenal in order to legalize economic independence. I stress once more—this is the most important task.

"In adopting documents and thinking about economic independence we should tell people as many times as possible: We are striving for independence, we are striving for the restoration of statehood. As for how to do this, how to do this so that not a single worker suffers during this important period of time, I think that in adopting cardinal decisions, also in our Supreme Soviet, we must always bear this in mind.

"I once again cordially thank you for the trust which you expressed in your vote. I will try to work according to my abilities, according to what my conscience dictates to me."

After thanking Astrauskas for his good work, Brazauskas concludes his remarks at 1032 GMT. He then answers questions concerning the structure of the Lithuanian Communist Party primary organizations. Deputy Kazimieras Uoka asks when Communist Party primary organizations will be reformed. Deputy Antanavicius asks if Brazauskas informed Gorbachev at some point during his visit to the republic that his objective is the solution of a party conflict and that trying to discuss the structure of the statehood of this republic in the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee is not the right place, because communists have no legal power to solve problems of this nature.

A. Brazauskas answers in the affirmative.

At 1036 GMT, the session is adjourned for 20 minutes.

1056 GMT

LD1501123190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1056 GMT on 15 January resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius, after a 20-minute recess.

Discussion of the second question on the agenda—should Soviet soldiers located on the territory of this republic be given the right to vote in the elections to the Supreme Soviet and local soviets of this republic—begins at this time.

Lithuanian Justice Minister P. Kuris takes the floor. He reports on the preparatory work carried out to hold the referendum on this issue. Kuris explains that the Supreme Soviet session has no right to block the referendum at this stage, when the signatures have already been collected, unless it discovers that legal procedures have been violated.

The presidium proposes 11 February as the date for the referendum. Kuris adds that another opinion had been voiced in the presidium whereby the Supreme Soviet session would be able to make the amendments to the law on elections concerning servicemen's right to vote in the republic. P. Kuris concludes his report at 1108 GMT.

Lionginas Sepetys then announces that there are two options: to announce a referendum, or to solve the problems here without a referendum.

At 1110 GMT, Antanaitis proposes amending the law on elections to allow the soldiers of the Soviet troops who are not permanent residents of the republic to decide which candidate should be elected to the parliament of this republic. He adds that there are already too many elections.

At 1116 GMT, Anatolijus Rasteika reminds the house that he has already spoken against the decision to allow soldiers to vote at a previous Supreme Soviet session. He supports the proposal to amend the law on elections and resolve the issue without a referendum. He says the thousands of signatures collected for the referendum indicate what the majority of the people of Lithuania want.

At 1119 GMT, Kubilius says electors in his constituency want the session to resolve the issue instead of holding a referendum. It is high time the administration of this republic concentrates on economic problems.

At 1121 GMT, V. Landsbergis expresses support for the earlier proposal, suggesting a better formulation of the text. He says that an opinion poll on the issue should be conducted.

At 1124 GMT, Visakavicius reads an appeal from pediatricians at a children's clinic saying that the money saved could be given to the clinic which badly needs equipment and medicine.

At 1127 GMT, Jonas Gureckas says that nobody has the right to deprive any citizen of the USSR of the right to vote. Soldiers are citizens of the USSR. No law can change this right. All have the right to vote.

At 1133 GMT, Vencius states that the Lithuanian Democratic Party is of the opinion that servicemen should not be excluded from elections.

The debate continues and a stalemate is reached.

At 1144 GMT, the session is adjourned until 1300 GMT.

1300 GMT

LD1501140390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1300 GMT on 15 January resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius.

Chairman of the session Lionginas Sepetys proposes two alternatives: either to amend the law on election or to hold a referendum. 169 vote in favor of the first proposal.

At 1305 GMT, as a result of the vote, a decision is made to proceed along the lines of amending the law on elections of the Lithuanian SSR. Lionginas Sepetys reads out the part of the law dealing with the right of soldiers to vote.

The amendment to the article in the law on referendums is discussed. It provides that if the people of the republic demand a referendum on an issue, the Supreme Soviet can declare that the referendum is not needed because the question has been solved by other means.

At 1327 GMT Prof Landsbergis says that if the people of this republic demand a referendum on the independence of Lithuania, then, according to this amendment, the Supreme Soviet of the republic can declare this problem solved and maintain that Lithuania has enough independence already. Therefore, this would be an obstacle to a democratic solution of vital problems by the people.

At 1334 GMT, a vote is taken on the following: "The Supreme Soviet has eliminated the grounds for holding a referendum." 235 deputies vote in favor, no one votes against, and 2 abstain.

Sepetys declares that the Supreme Soviet has removed the reasons for holding the referendum. The problem has now been solved. No exceptions can be made concerning the right to vote: Only permanent residents of this republic can take part in the elections and be elected.

1340 GMT

LD1501144790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1340 GMT on 15 January continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius

The session confirms various decrees adopted during the period between the sessions by the Supreme Soviet Presidium, including regulations for the registration of political parties, amendments to the criminal code, medical treatment for alcoholics, and others.

At 1348 GMT, Zigmas Vaisvila takes the floor. He says that the activities of the party, of any party, at offices, factories, and at other places of work should be banned. People work there and do not make politics. He adds that people working in the legal system, such as judges, the militia etc, should not belong to any party.

At 1400 GMT, Brazauskas proposes that regulations on the registration of parties should be debated at the next session because this issue is very important.

At 1407 GMT, a vote is taken to submit the relevant amendments of the regulations for discussion by the Supreme Soviet Presidium: 249 vote in favor, no one votes against.

At 1410 GMT, Neinys proposes that the law on petty blackmarketeering be amended.

At 1426 GMT, a vote is taken on extending the period of time for nominating deputies in local elections. This is approved by a majority.

At 1429 GMT, the session is adjourned for 20 minutes.

1449 GMT

LD1501175890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1449 GMT on 15 January resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius. Deputy Larusas is now chairing the session.

The next point on the agenda concerns the changes in the Supreme Court. Jonas Algimantas Gusiunas, chairman of the Supreme Court, speaks mainly about judges who have retired and the candidates to replace him.

At 1458 GMT a deputy asks Gusiunas about the selection mechanism. He says that this selection and short-listing are not open to public. Deputy Vaisvila comments that this mechanism is unacceptable because it is not open.

Following this, two judges are elected as members of the Supreme Court.

At 1513 GMT Kubilius, chairman of the secretariat, reads questions to the session from Supreme Soviet deputies.

At 1526 Kuris, minister of justice, returns to Article 12 of the Referendum Law. He notes that the house has already voted in favor of the proposal that a referendum can be canceled if the Supreme Soviet finds that the grounds for the referendum have been removed by the problem being solved without a referendum. However, he says, some deputies have expressed their concern that

this could lead to the violation of human rights, because the Supreme Soviet could abuse these legal powers of canceling a referendum: "The abovementioned prerogative of the Supreme Soviet to cancel a referendum does not apply to those cases that have been named in Part 1 of Article 7 of this Referendum Law."

Voting is as follows: 233 in favor, none against, and no abstentions.

At 1531 Kazimiera Prunskine says that the USSR Council of Ministers issued a regulation according to which savings banks belong to the state banks of the USSR. She notes that this conflicts with the economic independence of the republic and asks the Supreme Soviet session to rescind the validity of this regulation in this republic. By a majority of 240 the regulation is made invalid in this republic.

At 1546 Kazimieras Motieka speaks about the Law on Constitutional Supervision adopted by the Supreme Soviet on 23 December 1989. Motieka argues that this law was aimed at consolidating the unitarian state and the Soviet empire. It is clear, Motieka says, that the task of the Law of Constitutional Supervision is to block democratic movement in the Union republics. He invites all deputies to defend the laws that the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has adopted and to fight against the Law of constitutional Supervision which has legal powers to repeal any law adopted by the republican Supreme Soviet.

At 1600 GMT the session decides to put to a vote a resolution to declare the law on constitutional supervision invalid in the republic. A prolonged discussion on procedure begins. A statement by the Baltic parliamentary group, adopted in Moscow and declaring the law on constitutional supervision invalid, is read. It is included in the first article of the session's resolution. There are 133 votes in favor. The second article states that this law on constitutional supervision is invalid in the republic; 165 deputies voted in favor. Then the session votes for the third article in the resolution: to draw up a law on the republic's constitutional court; 175 deputies vote in favor. The vote for the whole draft resolution to declare the constitutional law invalid in the republic is as follows: 205 for, 1 against, 18 abstain.

Thus the resolution on the invalidity of the Law on Constitutional Supervision in the republic is adopted.

At 1643 Reception deteriorates, and the station becomes unmonitorable for 5 minutes.

At 1648 there is a statement by a group of deputies containing the objection about the procedure of electing Brazauskas as chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. No decision on this is made. Deputies applaud his election.

At 1654 Deputy Jagminas replies to questions on agriculture, damage inflicted on forests by army operations, and the purchasing prices of milk, meat, etc.

At 1704 GMT the session concludes its work and the relay ends.

Brazauskas Election Shows Party Winning Trust

*LD1501145890 Moscow World Service in English
1400 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] The leader of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania, Algirdas Brazauskas, has been elected president of this Baltic republic. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, the republic's parliament, voted overwhelming for Brazauskas, who had presided over his party's secession from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union late last year.

Mr Brazauskas was running for president against two candidates fielded by the Lithuanian grassroots movement Sajudis.

Our correspondent was told by Lithuanian officials that Mr Brazauskas' victory over the immensely popular Sajudis candidates clearly indicates that the Communist Party of Lithuania was winning back the trust of the people since it embarked on the road to independence.

A Sajudis spokeswoman has dismissed the nomination as a public relations act of the Communist Party, aimed to ward off a major defeat in the polls.

Astrauskas Resigns as Lithuanian Parliament Head

*LD1501083790 Vilnius Domestic Service
in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 15 Jan 90*

[Text] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium session has already taken place today in Vilnius. The republican government representative for information has just informed us that among other questions discussed at the sitting of the Presidium the request of Vytautas Astrauskas, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet chairman, to release him as chairman because of his health was discussed.

After a discussion the Presidium reached the decision to comply with the request. The question is given a further discussion, currently at the Council of Elders and later at the Supreme Soviet session.

Delegates Discuss Future of Lithuanian SSR, Party

*90UN0591E Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA
in Russian 21 Dec 89 pp 2, 3*

[Report on debate on Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee political report to 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress]

[Text] Yonas Kubilius, rector of Vilnius University, who began the debate, observed that Lithuania's inhabitants were already calling things by their proper name. The situation also demands this self-determination of the communists and recognition that no Lithuanian Communist Party has existed hitherto and that there has been merely a Lithuanian branch of the CPSU. But, as the

speaker observed, this branch was like the Trojan Horse in which proletarian revolution and the so-called restoration of Soviet power in 1940 were imported into Lithuania. The Lithuanian subdivision of the CPSU remains to this day a fifth column, using inveterate conservatives of the center to try to adjust the disrupted circulation between the metropolis and one of its colonies. Atoning for our guilt means restoring the political, legal, and social justice that was violated in accordance with and against our wishes; We must do it, first, by eliminating the consequences of the 1939 deal, the same deal that raised our party on the crest of a bloody political wave. However, in the context of all historical and contemporary realities, Lithuanian statehood is not only the goal of our program, expressing the cherished aspirations of the nation, but is also a problem of conscience for each of us. But can a party which is itself not independent declare ideas of state independence? Consequently, we have no choice. This is an answer to the question of what the status of our new party, which is being created today, should be.

The broadest strata of the Lithuanian population have perceived as their program the slogan: "Lithuania without sovereignty is a Lithuania without a future!" However, many contradictions arise since it is being proclaimed by a party which, it is said, does not have the right to decide on its own status.

A few weeks ago the worthy representative of a strong center, who honored us with a visit, plainly declared that the decrees of the Sejm in 1940 are lawful, although the delegates that participated therein were "elected" at ballot boxes surrounded by guns. These decrees remain in force, although neither the people who elected the delegates nor the delegates themselves had the least idea of what would be discussed at the approaching Sejm—forced elections, delegates without authority, a "blindfolded" Sejm. However, all was in accordance with the laws of historical materialism. What was sanctioned by the father and leader of all peoples was subject neither to appeal nor abrogation. And now the Lithuanian Communist Party congress, the first truly democratic congress in 50 years, has been condemned in advance. We may debate here as much as we please, we may declare what we please and confirm what documents we please; nevertheless, all will be illegal and wrong, although it was for this that we were elected and endowed with authority. All will be illegal and wrong, although such is the opinion of the majority of Lithuania's Communists—illegal and wrong since it was not agreed upon with Moscow beforehand and could serve as a bad example to others.

The guests flew in, performed their party assignment, and flew out again. But we remained; there is nowhere for us to go. Could it be that the whims of a visitor are more important than the cherished aspirations and hopes of the inhabitants of Lithuania? The more so in that we have recognized that no one will bring us either freedom or democracy from anywhere. A first, really practical step toward democratic life was the alteration

of Article 6 of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution. But let us not harbor illusions that the Lithuanian Communist Party is the sole party now capable of rallying society and leading it not autocratically but democratically. We will still have to really try to find our place among the other revived public movements and political forces. Our role and functions will be predetermined not by the machinery of compulsion which governs us and which is partially subordinate to us, but by our program and its implementation. It would seem that the time has come to comprehend our own experience and the experience of kindred parties in order to ascertain for ourselves what links us with other progressive forces of society, what the basis of our consolidation might be, what divides us, and what makes us unique and encourages our unification in a separate party. Not a hunting down of flaws, not a sharing out of credit, and not a primitive struggle for power, but the cohesive work of all will enable us to achieve that to which we aspire.

Romanas Songayla, first secretary of Mazheykskiy Raykom, said that the debate on the restructuring of the Lithuanian Communist Party encompassing a wide range of questions of party life, and its policy has reached its apogee. Obviously, at the congress today we must raise the question of whether the center—that is, Moscow—will continue to be the repository of ideas of perestroika or whether the union republics also may make their contribution to it. If such initiatives continue to be evaluated in the traditional manner, only by the yardsticks acceptable to the center, it may be said that perestroika is already exhausted. For this reason, the decisions adopted at our congress could and should impart newness to this process. I believe that this is what is expected by both all of Lithuania and the country's progressive forces. The CPSU should not be restructured to the screenplay of its apparatus.

En route to the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, we are not suspending perestroika and or impeding it, the speaker said, but imparting impetus to a radical restructuring of the CPSU, the essence of which does not at the present time correspond to the idea of the federation of the USSR which is being propagandized.

While seeking the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the adoption of its program and statutes, we see on this path many obstacles and difficulties—primarily the party's position following the congress in respect to its membership and the unity of its ranks. Of course, there will inevitably be a decline in the number of members—the party will be abandoned by the fellow-travelers who joined it with ulterior motives. Some of them have already left the party, incidentally. The worst thing is that a split in the party and a reduction in the number of its members are possible due to certain political ambitions, traditional thinking, and the glorification of unitary trends. The sole motive for self-determination should be the expression of Lithuania's political sovereignty and the wishes of its inhabitants. A party divorced from the wishes and cherished

aspirations of the people is doomed as a political force. It may be established and maintained administratively, but under the conditions of political competition this is impossible. After all, we altered Article 6 of the Constitution at the Supreme Soviet session.

It is obvious that the Lithuanian Communist Party's aspiration to independence is incomprehensible to and undesirable for the center. It is easy to say that it is necessary, given such a situation, to seek mutual understanding and not complicate relations. However, it is a question of the concordance of different positions; and in this sense we have no great choice—we live in Lithuania and, consequently, must be guided primarily by the aspirations of its inhabitants. Finally, the center will have to recognize the Lithuanian Communist Party in the form it takes after this congress.

In taking the step toward the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, we are obliged to concentrate attention on practical matters and to discuss, for example, the mechanism of ties to and relations with the CPSU, making specific the principle of cooperation, which we have already cited. What kind of relations there will be between the CPSU and the Lithuanian Communist Party will depend to a considerable extent on the benevolence of the center and on its ability to recognize our position and, in addition, not only to support our nonstandard solutions but also to follow this example itself. We frequently hear claims that events in the Baltic, in Lithuania specifically, have gotten ahead of the processes of perestroika in the country. This includes our aspiration to party independence and the activity of Lithuania's Communists under the conditions of political competition following renunciation of the party's leading role. Opponents may say that this is leading to the party's self-denial and to chaos in the country. This will depend on who wishes to see what in this.... Sooner or later the development of democracy, if it continues, will bring about the need for such transformations. In Lithuania this has already become a reality, and it has to be reckoned with.

Addressing delegates of the Russian and Polish nationalities, Romas Gudaitis, secretary of the party organization of the Lithuanian Writers Union, said:

Lithuania is your homeland too. What alternatives to this Lithuania do you propose? Or is it your purpose merely to deny the ideas of our revival? And on what is this fidelity to the past, which we no longer want but which for you is so desirable, based? Do your views correspond to the aspirations of many communists—Russians, Poles, and people of other nationalities? In the "Baltic chain" we felt the warmth of their hands and the beating of their hearts in the name of our concord. I do not wish to believe that the pace of perestroika in the CPSU satisfies the majority of communists and noncommunists of non-Lithuanian nationality and that they do not link their hopes with a cardinal restructuring of the Lithuanian party. The independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party is not our homespun idea. It is not

only that there are deep-lying factors of independence. This has been brought about also by the sluggishness of the CPSU and its inability to abandon dogmatic assertions, crossing the threshold of democratic candor, and establishing dialogue. The independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, as equally the aspiration to sovereignty, is not being brought closer by the concessions of A. Brazauskas, V. Berezov, and Yu. Paletskis to a small group of "Sajudis" radicals, but by the lack of faith of the majority in the capacity of the CPSU for regeneration into a democratic party. The Lithuanian Communist Party's aspiration to independence has undoubtedly been motivated also by the appearance of new political parties. The process of the recreation and revival of Lithuanian social democracy is evoking our greatest interest, as are its attempts to appeal to hearts and minds with a more human manifesto of social justice. It is easy for other parties to begin with stern criticism. For us it is more difficult, since we are haunted by the criminal shadow of our predecessors in this party. Nonetheless, it is most difficult not for us but for the people of Lithuania. They are weary of waiting for change and order. They are tired of declarations and political rivalry and they understand that the period of transition to Lithuania's statehood has been dragged out, and dragged out through the fault of the present Lithuanian Communist Party, its structure and leadership.

The speaker emphasized that the conscientious part of the party must primarily have its say at the congress because, thanks to it, we have been afforded the historic opportunity to proclaim an independent Lithuanian Communist Party which sharply dissociates itself from the genocide and postwar and later crimes, and recognizes equality in a multiparty democratic system. And because we are being afforded an opportunity to arm ourselves with the resolve to do away with the current imperfect social structure and to replace it with democratic socialism. One has inwardly ceased to agree with the political scenarios of struggle in which there is much of the honest truth about an independent Lithuania, but little sincere pain on account of today's social sores and troubles. Although the question of power is not open to discussion—this is the prerogative of the will of the people to be expressed in democratic elections. However, we should be thinking even now about those prepared to work and to take risks. If we do not affirm the principle of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party or entangle it in compromise references, we will be committing a crime against conscience, hope, and Lithuania. This would be an act of indifference, and we would be contributing to the total destruction of the institutions of power even before the elections.

Having sought permission to continue his speech, R. Gudaytis went on to describe the important meeting in Moscow with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Although several important matters were broached in the discussion, nothing was said about a most delicate issue—the

independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the approaching congress. The reasons for this are clear and need no comment.

In conclusion, the delegate expressed his proposals pertaining to a draft document on relations with the CPSU.

Kyastutis Zaletskas, first secretary of the Vilnius Gorkom [City Party Committee], emphasized that the success of the congress would depend to a considerable extent on whether the delegates could avoid malice and insults and on whether they would try to listen to one another.

This congress could be historic if it succeeds in objectively evaluating the past and answering the most topical questions of the life of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Algirdas Brazauskas' political report was a good start. Everyone is excited most by the main question—the statutes of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The secretary spoke about responsibility for the fate of the Lithuanian Communist Party and about not rectifying one historical mistake by making another. He disagreed with the compromise resolutions in the solution of questions of principle—the restoration of statehood, the socialist path, intra-party life, and democratization and humanization. But it would be an unforgivable mistake were the aspirations of certain arrogant groups and the different opinions about tactics to cause a split in the party. A united and strong party capable of occupying an important place in Lithuania's political system is necessary. But such unity in the Vilnius party organization is lacking, K. Zaletskas observed. The party gorkom and its bureau and the rayon committees are trying to consolidate the communists and all social groups and to avoid possible conflicts.

The Vilnius delegation at the congress will defend different platforms and action programs. The party forum will help unite them. It is not important that the party members of this generation did not participate in the grim events of the past; all communists currently bear the moral responsibility for the mistakes of the time of stagnation and the crimes of the Stalin period. For this reason, only comprehension and an analysis of the past conclusions and specific activity could rehabilitate the communists in the eyes of society. It is important to assure the inhabitants of Lithuania that the party will consciously participate in the achievement of the common goal—the revival of Lithuania's statehood and the renewal of society.

The secretary spoke about the global idea of independence, which had taken possession of everyone and behind which were arrayed a mass of complex economic and social problems. For the people, every day is becoming increasingly menacing. It is disquieting when in this complex situation a politicized society is rudderless, as it were. The ship of Lithuania is drifting, rolling now to one side, now to the other. The model of Western democracy is supported in the center strata and groupings. Political stability is achieved because power in

these countries moves sometimes to the center-right, sometimes to the center-left parties and never to radical right-wing parties. With us the positions of the centrists is unpopular, mute and invisible. Some people are cheaply heralding independence, others the abolition of all privileges and any form of "wage-leveling" and do not preclude vengeance even, but the centrists are proposing the preservation of some things from the era of totalitarianism lest society find itself plunged into complete chaos.

K. Zaletskas said in conclusion that the majority of communists advocates the consistent development of democracy, a sovereign Lithuania, and an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and statutes. The congress will have to show who for the sake of the common goal will content himself with compromise and who, owing to his fundamental principles, cannot remain with the majority. For this reason a mechanism affording one an opportunity to freely express one's opinion and to seek its support on the part of the majority should be provided for in an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Currently some people are racing too far ahead, while others are tarrying. Today we need to find a platform that unites the party and does away with the alienation between the party's local components and its leaders and between communists of all nationalities.

Proclamation of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party is not a one-time act, it is a process, like the building of a sovereign Lithuania. A transition period, in which the Lithuanian Communist Party's new relations with a gradually changing CPSU would take shape, is essential.

The development of events in the Lithuanian Communist Party and the result that we have brought to the congress have graphically underlined the main contradictions of intra-party democracy, Aleksey Kulakov, secretary of the party committee of Snechkus community, said. The principal contradiction is the absence in the party of a mechanism for alternative opinions. In the argument about intra-party democracy not a word has been said about a mechanism that would assure its development not in word but in deed. In creating a party of the new type, V.I. Lenin united various parties, platforms, and directions for the sake of a common goal—the ouster of autocracy and the victory of socialist revolution.

Following the October victory, the party lived for some time in an atmosphere of differing opinions. Subsequently this was forcibly rejected right down to the physical extermination of dissidents.

There are in the party several schools on this issue of principle. In real life we have approached a split of the party organizations both in the Lithuanian Communist Party and in the CPSU as a whole. There has been a series of plenums of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. What is surprising is that one has

the impression that these processes are not occurring, that there are no corresponding appeals and resolutions. I have not noticed anxiety on the part of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau or attempts to find a mechanism to avoid a split. We have come to the congress without having found a single point of contact. I do not envy the members of any party which might emerge as the result of our congress. None would be more democratic or wiser, the reverse rather since we have failed to understand where the strength of the organization and its viability lie. They lie in regard for the diversity of opinions. We still have a chance to prevent mistakes and explain this to the communists, and not fool them with the routine independence slogan and with the fact that, having gained party independence, they will begin to live more freely and better.

The delegate proposed the adoption of a resolution on the existence and activity of factions within the Lithuanian Communist Party which ideologically and organizationally do not go beyond the statutory framework, the nonadoption of a Lithuanian Communist Party program, and additional work on the Lithuanian Communist Party statutes and their use as an alternative draft for discussion at the 28th CPSU Congress and support for it to be brought forward.

The current situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party is quite complex, A. Kulakov observed. Driving to the congress, it took the Snechkus delegates 90 minutes to cover the 30-km stretch of the road between Dukstas and Ignalina. The road was slippery and all the delegates had double feelings. First, they did not like the speed at which they were traveling, and, second, everyone understood that, were it increased, there would be a corresponding increase in the potential for ending up in the ditch. This is roughly how I see the situation that has currently taken shape in the Lithuanian Communist Party. I support a change in the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party and independent decisions on questions of party life and organizational, structural, personnel, and financial matters, taking account of the specifics of national conditions and requirements. But I also support a united Lithuanian Communist Party and as part of the CPSU ideologically and organizationally. And I see our republic in the federation of the Soviet Union.

The intensification of the economic and political crisis in the republic is into its second year now, the writer Vitautas Petkyavichyus said. In one part of society an illegal and bureaucratic bourgeoisie is growing, in the other, mass poverty. Our life in general is coming to be controlled increasingly by incompetents. Obviously, we have all created the current situation, and therefore we are all obliged to answer for it. The most prudent thing would be for everyone at this congress to get together, to think and to seek the soundest paths toward surmounting the crisis. Therefore let us cast aside the atheistic sanctimoniousness, that so recently and so painfully grated on the ear, of Genzyalis with his

preaching of party cleansing; let us cast aside the pseudo-philosophical separatist possibility with the aid of some vague mechanism of detaching communism from Bolshevism which Ozolas has discerned; let us cast aside the Suwalki version, proposed by Gudaitis, of the suicide of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which people intend tormenting with all the crimes engendered in Moscow and more or less realized in Lithuania, glossing over the fact that our republic emerged with the least losses from the Stalinists' cult of totalitarian violence, but let us with the same resolve cast aside also the bankrupt playing-safe policy of the arrogant Guryatskas and let us dissociate ourselves from Ivanov with his devotion to the old habits and assertions that only in a common pot, only in the historically nonvindicated and forcible conglomerate of different peoples can we discover national revival and feel independent; and let us cast aside, finally, the policy of unscrupulous time-serving, which has been so remarkably perfected by Konoplev and which can do nothing for the party except repainting the facades.

The disorderly and dual position in the party emerged, in the speaker's opinion, because M.S. Gorbachev, who proclaimed the policy of perestroika, has been totally unable for four years to abandon the imperial thinking customary for many leaders of the CPSU and is still attempting to transform the union not on the basis of new, really democratic principles but is endeavoring to somehow patch up, clean, and re sew its old great-power uniform, perforated by unmerited decorations, forgetting about the characterization of such activity revealed by Herzen and very aptly formulated by him: When we Russians start to think, we are Europeans, but hardly have we begun to act, and we are Asians. This duality of political actions and declarations long since spread to our republic also.

We can only implement the slogan "Lithuania without sovereignty is a Lithuania without a future," which has conquered us all and which is the sole promising one, by proceeding, in the speaker's opinion, along the path of national unity. The idea of a common current is not new. The speaker recalled here the priest Antanas Matskyavichyus, leader of the 1863 uprising, and Yonas Basanavichyus and Vintasas Kudirka, heralds of national revival; recalled Vintasas Mitskyavichyus-Kapsukas and the difficult situation of 1940; and spoke about the idea of national reconciliation preserved in the postwar years in the thoughts of Balis Sruoga, Kazis Boruta, and other intellectuals.

I am for the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Vitautas Petkyavichyus emphasized in conclusion. However, each of us joins the party individually, and for this reason it would be more correct to decide this question also by way of a general party referendum.

The establishment of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party is an essential condition for the immediate democratic restructuring of the party and simultaneously of Lithuanian society's movement

toward a civilized condition in political life, Donatas Morkunas, second secretary of the Shyauliyay Gorkom, said. Much work needs to be done to ensure that the present drafts become the actual party program pointing the way to society. It is essential to elaborate the concept and statutes of a democratic party and strictly abandon the centralized bureaucratic structure and functions uncharacteristic of a political party. The party's new functions are devising programs for society's development and propagandizing them in the course of the electoral struggle for power. The need for the present city and rayon party machinery also will disappear, and there will be a change in the structure of the primary organizations and their place and role. There will be a change also in the character of the party. These are fundamental, necessary changes if we do not wish the democratizing society to reject the party as an alien body. Is it possible to accomplish all this while still part of the CPSU? The CPSU is not prepared for such a program and structural reforms. The promises of profound radical changes in the CPSU Program and Statutes materialized one day in the CPSU platform on nationality relations, which "satisfied everyone." It is a question of independent activity and one's own program and statutes. One is amazed at the directive to the effect that the Lithuanian Communist Party should be independent, but simultaneously participate in the CPSU's elective authorities. Is it not clear that, by becoming a part of a single party and its leading authorities, we would become subordinate to and a component of a single CPSU. It is maintained that we would participate in the leading bodies of the CPSU, but would implement our own program and adhere to our own statutes. To what, however, would Lithuania's communists convert the CPSU Central Committee were the leading authority to become invalid? Let us summon up the courage to acknowledge that it is a question merely of autonomy within the CPSU. Otherwise the public of Lithuania would see this merely as the latest and on this occasion truly the last perfidy. I believe, the speaker emphasized, that this is a simple lack of understanding. Participation in a CPSU organized per the federalism principle on a basis of parity representation is hardly acceptable. First, there is as yet no such CPSU, not even a Russian Communist Party and independent communist parties of the republics. Second, federalism means that common leadership would be exercised; will, unity, and standardization would be imposed; and it would be necessary to subordinate ourselves to an idea born far from Lithuania. And the political report observes that for the specific national union of state formations, such as is the USSR, federal relations are insufficient, but it is precisely the federal principle that is proposed for mutual relations between the parties.

We should not, the delegate continued, in aspiration for the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party fear a split in the present party. A party is an alliance of the like-minded, and not a single organization consisting of people thinking variously and aspiring to different goals. It is the desire to unite opposite goals and the substitution of the goal of unity for community of goal

which lead organizations to centralization and bureaucracy and distort and destroy the essence and content of a political party. The announcement of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party is the sole method of preserving a viable party. Those who caution that with the announcement of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party we would find ourselves politically isolated forget about the danger of another kind of isolation— isolation from the problems demanding solution and from the Lithuanian public. The respected Algirdas Brazauskas proved at the 21st Plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee that in founding a sovereign Lithuanian Communist Party we were not committing a crime either before Marxism or before Leninism. If we maintain that the party advocates the constitutional parliamentary path of the establishment of Lithuania's sovereignty, let us be consistent—the aspiration to the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party is a fragment of the constitutional parliamentary path. Such is the position of the majority of delegates of the city of Shyalyay. It is reflected by the resolution of the Shyalyay city party conference, the speaker said in conclusion.

If we have embarked on the realization of the republic's economic and political independence, and our ultimate goal is independence and establishing statehood for an independent socialist democratic Lithuania, the Lithuanian Communist Party may only arrive at this goal as a sovereign and independent party, Yonas Vitkunas, deputy chairman of Shirvintskiy Rayon's "Kernave" Kolkhoz [collective farm], said. Ties to the CPSU need not be severed but reorganized into relations of equal partners.

Centralized leadership of all political and economic spheres and the one-party system have not justified themselves. A dogmatic, opportunist interpretation of the principles of socialism, repression, problems of the nationality issue, and the disregard for the objective dialectic of economic and political relations have brought the country to profound economic and political crisis.

The party aspires to leadership, and this is impeding perestroika in the organization itself, which is lagging behind the changes in society.

Economic sovereignty is inseparable from political sovereignty and thereby from an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. There could in this situation be two paths: Defending the processes emanating from below or coming to a halt and confining ourselves merely to reforms.

Y. Vitkunas observed that it is still being proposed that Lithuania's communists wait. The CPSU Central Committee plenum on nationality issues compared the party's independence and right of choice with separatism. Yet union is independence, and not compulsion. The possibility of establishing Russian as the statewide

language is a lack of respect for all peoples of the USSR as a leftover of the times of Stalinism and stagnation.

Opponents of various persuasions are today calling on us to wait and unite under the banner of Leninism. Is it not under that that is held by the center? We have been uniting for 72 years and need to come together under a banner that will solve the current radical problems.

The delegates of Shirvintskiy Rayon propose that the immediate goal of the Lithuanian Communist Party be considered the elaboration of the economic and political prerequisites which help in the restoration of Lithuania's sovereignty and realization of the republic citizens' choice. There is no renewed union as yet, and for this reason it is inexpedient talking about an independent Lithuania in an alliance of sovereign republics. The congress' main task is reorganization of the Lithuanian Communist Party into an independent party maintaining relations with the CPSU with equal-partner status.

In the opinion of Y. Vitkunas, we have a common enemy—the ossified political system which has turned the union into a unitary state. Partial reforms will not help, and only the free who have made their choice can unite and enter into an alliance.

Gerardas Masyulis, first secretary of the Ignalinskii Raykom, emphasized in his speech that the report to the congress of the first secretary of the republic party organization objectively sets forth the position of the bulk of Lithuania's communists on topical issues.

The ideas of the party were brought about by perestroika, which was dictated by life and the will of the people, he said. While having called for perestroika, the CPSU has not as yet displayed due initiative and has not become the real organizer of perestroika. Its casting about and experimentation testify that it is not possible to objectively forecast the development of the events of social life. Other than promises, nothing specific has been done, but the times demand actual and immediate solutions. What is needed mainly is responsibility for their implementation. Therefore, there naturally arises the question: Can rebukes be leveled at us who are seeking a way out of the crisis situation in policy, the economy, and the social and other spheres? The majority of us fails to understand and condemns the persistent warnings, counsel, and homilies from the center, which amount to appeals to the republic's communists not to make haste and not harm perestroika but merely think and propose. Although we are well aware of all the problems, the 28th congress, it is believed, will solve them better than us. But democratization in society is proceeding very rapidly, but lagging behind in the party. Political processes in Lithuania are occurring considerably more rapidly than in other republics. However, the present CPSU program and statutes absolutely fail to correspond to the demands of the times and fetter any progressive initiative and independence. Therefore, there is no point waiting, and we do not have the right to

wait until the 28 th CPSU Congress. It is not clear, incidentally, what the course of perestroika up to this congress will be like—after all, democratization processes are being hampered by the centralization of both party and state life. Understanding this, the majority of the rayon's communists have advocated radical and immediate perestroika in the party. We are for an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own statutes and program and equal cooperation, based on trust, with the CPSU and other republic parties and progressive movements. We are for the consolidation of all peoples living in the republic. The burgeoning of Lithuania and the recreation of its independence and statehood lie in the aspiration to a common goal of party and people. Let us not fence ourselves off from either East or West.

The communists condemn the illegal deportation and repression of innocent people, support the findings of the republic state commission on the events of 1939-1940, and demand that the truth be told at the highest level. Abandoning the vanguard role of the party and its exclusive rights in society, we must now set an example of democracy and respect for other political parties and public movements. Before the journey to this congress, the rayon's communists wished us resolve and cohesion and asked us not to adopt hasty decisions which could harm the Lithuanian Communist Party in renewal and at the same time not to afford those who think otherwise a pretext for direct intervention in our affairs.

We are being watched closely today not only by Lithuania, the whole world is looking on with hope and concern, waiting to see whether we will be able to adopt new, cardinal solutions corresponding to the people's cherished aspirations, Yanina Gagilene, first secretary of Vilnius' Leninskiy Raykom, said. It would be far easier making a decision if everyone understood and wished to understand the position of the majority of inhabitants of Lithuania. The mistake some people make is that they are not guided in their thinking and actions by the dialectic and practice of life. On the other hand, both close and more distant neighbors also expect from us particularly responsible decisions during this historic period. Lacking exhaustive information about the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party and in the republic as a whole, considerable numbers of delegates have come to the congress mentally attuned against radical transformations, and for this reason I appeal to the delegates to once more discuss the situation and weigh what primarily unites us all. We are united by the land of Lithuania, its inhabitants, and the desire to live on it and work and create. K. Marx wrote that neither the international conjunction of the proletariat nor the peaceful and conscious cooperation of these nations in the achievement of common goals are possible without the independence and unity of each individual nation having been secured. History has confirmed that he was right, but the leaders of the CPSU have ignored his teaching. It is this proposition by K. Marx that we are endeavoring to realize in reviving Lithuania's statehood.

Defending the interests of the unitary state, the present nationality policy of the CPSU cannot correspond to today's aspirations of the peoples of the union. For this reason the Lithuanian Communist Party proclaims as its main goal the creation of an independent, democratic, socialist law-based state because only the inhabitants of such a state of all nationalities can independently build their life and be equal before the law. A dual morality must be alien to Lithuania's communists, we cannot be just in respect to ourselves and unjust in respect to another.

Of course, it is unrealistic to expect that such aggressive speakers as Ivanov or Kucheroov could be the creators of a Lithuanian state. Nor is anyone demanding this. Lithuanians should create their state, and the other peoples living in the republic should contribute to this and respect our laws and traditions. They would be guaranteed for this opportunities for developing their culture and their native language and participating in the running of the state. So little, it would seem, is necessary for ensuring that we enjoy good mutual relations.

The Lithuanian Communist Party would enjoy authority if, in proclaiming the principle of justice, it applied it first of all in respect to its own members. And if there are in the party members guilty before the people and the state, a renewed Lithuanian Communist Party is obliged to make an evaluation of this.

The independence of a political party was described very accurately by Iokubas Minkyavichyus, corresponding member of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, who maintained that independence is a method of self-realization and the basis of relations with others.

The principles of organization of the Lithuanian Communist Party elaborated by communists of Vilnius University observe that the Lithuanian Communist Party will seek the restructuring of the CPSU and a restructuring of the communist parties of the republics in the union. So our goal is not to sever ties to the CPSU but to transform them. This is a model of the restructuring of the CPSU which is proposed by Lithuania's communists and is being realized even today—from command subordination to dignified and creative partnership. Although recognizing that perestroika in the party is lagging behind, the present CPSU Central Committee does not desire radical change. But the CPSU Central Committee is not the whole party!

I am convinced that our example will be followed by the communist parties of other republics also. The new Lithuanian Communist Party statutes are an attempt to irreversibly bar the way to a relapse into the Stalin times, dogmatism, and stagnation.

The delegate appealed to party veterans, maintaining that it was not they who were to blame for the sorry results of the CPSU leadership. The party system and party power are to blame. The speaker called for people

to heed the words of Antanas Barkauskas spoken at the 22d Plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

I hope, the delegate said in conclusion, that you with such bitter experience of life will find within yourselves strength, wisdom, conscience, and resolve. I believe that you will throw off the shackles of dogmatism and will support the revival of the party today, here, at this congress.

In recent years the role of the Lithuanian Communist Party has diminished through our own fault—this was the position affirmed in the speech by Leon Yankelevich, first secretary of the Shaichininksiy Raykom. The speaker went on to emphasize that in the course of constant and unavailing debate on behalf of the people and for the sake of their welfare the bill for unrealized programs and promises had finally been presented. The main thing today, therefore, the speaker believed, should be discussion of how to emerge from the current critical situation and how to unite all communists and all inhabitants of the republic. The majority simply cannot wait to hear their main desire—proclamation of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party and the legalization of its withdrawal from the CPSU. However, there is another opinion also: An absolute majority of communists of Shalchininksiy Rayon advocates at this stage the necessity of remaining in a united CPSU in renewal. The speaker adduced several arguments in confirmation. This would affect primarily the objective economic situation of our republic and its close ties to the national economic complex of the entire country. In addition, while supporting the policy of perestroika, they understand that only together is it possible to achieve the best results.

Discussing the draft Lithuanian Communist Party statutes, Leon Yankelevich noted certain things which, in his view, needed changing. First, the unduly simplified procedure of admittance to the party giving extensive leeway to a variety of careerists. Second, the program of protection of the interests of the national minorities is discussed insufficiently specifically and precision in this draft. L. Yankelevich declared that the inhabitants of other nationalities were justifiably concerned at the hastily enacted legislative instruments and the unnecessary statements in the press causing much bewilderment. It was proposed that the congress' Editorial Commission amplify the clauses of the Lithuanian Communist Party Program which deal with the interests of the national minorities.

In conclusion the speaker emphasized once again that the slogan "A sovereign Lithuanian Communist Party for a sovereign Lithuania" is even in the present organizational structures being successfully realized in practice. For this reason I suggest that the most rational thing today would be to confine ourselves to the adoption of a practical program of the activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party and to speak and decide without

undue haste, seriously and cogently, seeking ways of rapprochement, and not division.

Nothing is repeated in history other than mistakes. Therefore mistakes, both our own and others', need to be analyzed, Bronislovas Genzylis, secretary of the party committee of Vilnius University, said. He emphasized that we must recall not only the last 50 years but a longer period also, beginning in 1918. The 1926 coup, according to the speaker, cannot be termed either fascist or progressive. Also responsible were Lithuania's communists, who, inspired by the All-Russia Communist Party (Bolshevik), were unwilling to operate within the framework of the constitution. The point being that the slogan "Workers of the world, unite" made sense to them, and Stalinism had yet to conclusively reveal itself as the successor of Russian imperialism. Not understanding the real situation, the leaders of Lithuania's communists introduced instability to the state body that was taking shape. We can today understand the handful of communist members of the underground organization, who believed in the sun of Stalin and the shining future of communism. However, we cannot justify their present and former myopia, frequently inseparable from a betrayal of national interests.

The Lithuanian Communist Party has always had various people—both time-serving and honest. By way of example the speaker mentioned P. Glovatskas, Yu. Vayshnoras, Yu. Bulavas, and others who tried to ease the lot of the Lithuanian people. At this congress, according to him, we must settle accounts with our conscience and prove that the future of Lithuania is dear to Lithuania's communists and that they know how to sacrifice themselves.

We must remember, the speaker continued, that perestroika in Lithuania was begun not by the Communist Party but some people in the party. There was no other way at that time. And to say that we are all to blame for the past is unethical, at the very least. After all, some people cultivated rotten matter, others sought ways of protecting themselves against it. And it is not surprising that considerable numbers of scholars, figures of culture, and communists of Lithuania were some of the instigators of the Lithuanian movement for perestroika. Conflict had ripened between them and the party machinery and also the forces supporting it which continues to this day.

Every communist must decide whose side he is on—that of the people or a fifth column. The danger to the existence of the Lithuanian people has not disappeared. Imperial thinking, which the USSR people's deputies perceive at every step, is predominant in Moscow's governing circles. And the independence that has been granted us is reminiscent of a confused horse which has been released into a field and which an owner may at any moment tie up again.

The Soviet Union was intended as an alliance of sovereign states. Subsequently, thanks to Stalin, there

remained of the USSR only the name. Now attempts are being made once again to give legal shape to what was thought up by Stalin. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo continues to operate in accordance with the principles formulated by Stalin. Submitting to the continued diktat of the Central Committee would mean leading the Lithuanian Communist Party to catastrophe. We know how dearly the submissiveness of their leaders has cost the Lithuanian people. Let us not act thus now, particularly in the face of the consolidation of reactionary forces throughout the country.

Further relations with the CPSU, the speaker emphasized in conclusion, will depend on how it restructures itself and whether it is able to dissociate itself from the inglorious past. We understand that we are obliged to get along with our neighbors—no country can manage without economic and political cooperation with other countries—and we understand that we must seek concord with the representatives of all peoples living in Lithuania also. Only when the inhabitants of Lithuania, regardless of nationality, understand that an independent Lithuania will defend their rights, as the rights of Lithuanians, will we achieve concord and economic prosperity.

Vytautas Arbaciauskas, first secretary of the Kaunas Gorkom, emphasized that the Lithuanian Communist Party has no other path than the path toward independence. In the current political situation this is the sole possible solution.

Many of us understand the independence of our party alike, he said. It means the legalized nature of the program aspirations in the program and the statutes, which regulate the functioning of the party and the election of the executive authorities, which are subordinate merely to their own party.... What can we offer in exchange for our present relations with the CPSU? Primarily, I believe, our ideological community and coordination in action when pursuing the party's economic and political actions, on the basis of equal partnership, and not subordination, however. We understand that we do not live in a different hemisphere and do not believe that relations with the CPSU are impossible. They are possible, but only on condition of their conversion on the basis of equal cooperation. If the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo really support Lithuania's communists not only in word but also in practice, it would be more useful if not only we but they also sought new formulas and new forms of relations between the communist parties corresponding to the changing relations between the states within our alliance. It remains merely to be regretted that the CPSU as it is now constituted at one time abandoned the idea that is being implemented in the party currently.

Of course, I harbor no illusions, the delegate emphasized, that the party's independence will in itself resolve its problems and ensure the communists' popularity. Neither we nor the inhabitants of Lithuania whose interests they represent need a party for the sake of a

party. The more so in that the situation of the Lithuanian Communist Party, despite the declared goals, remains and will evidently continue to be difficult. It is weighed down by the burden of responsibility for the situation that has been created in society. However, we consciously choose this path and are ourselves setting ourselves the examination and will ourselves have to pass it if we really wish to move from totalitarianism to democracy.

I believe that ahead lie difficult discussions within the party itself, which will not halt and could, perhaps, merely accelerate the party's independence, and, possibly, results of the coming election campaign unfavorable for the Communist Party. However, the party will be strengthened not only by victories but by setbacks also. Finally, the time has come to share responsibility for Lithuania's present and future with all political forces.

The desire to avoid a split in the party does not mean that it should not rid itself of people who have compromised themselves. People who are on the other side of the barricades also may be respected for ideological conviction. However, any party is compromised by deserters and figures who do not enjoy authority.

There are in the Kaunas city party organization communists of various views, and this is reflected in the composition of our delegation, but the party organization as a whole is fully resolved to strive for fundamental reforms both within the party and in society. And we will take these first steps both at home and here, at this congress, also. The majority of delegates from Kaunas advocated the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party outside of the CPSU. However, I would like henceforth for the party's actions to be more united, coordinated, and purposeful, and not as has been the case thus far.

Today for the first time for many years, the delegate said in conclusion, Lithuania's communists are choosing their own way, listening to benevolent advice and checking out their ideas in conversations with like-minded people and at the same time are fully resolved to be independent and to be guided by the interests of people living in Lithuania and aspire to democracy and social progress.

We delegates from Alitus, Feliksas Dzhyautas, first secretary of the Alitus Gorkom, said, representing more than 4,000 communists of the city and the rayon, have come here with a clear guideline, which was formulated at the time of the meetings and the report conference of the city party organization and subsequently, following the election of the delegates, meetings in the work force. The position of the Alitus communists, with a few exceptions, is as follows: Reorganization of the party subdivision of the CPSU into an independent Lithuanian Communist Party uniting citizens of Lithuania of all nationalities who are prepared to contribute to realizing the aspirations of the republic's inhabitants. Some

96 percent of the participants in a poll that was conducted advocated an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. We were instructed to adopt the Lithuanian Communist Party program and statutes at the congress. Our delegation supports the first version of the program and the draft statutes, and proposes that the congress adopt them. The next step should be the recreation of an independent, democratic, law-based Lithuanian state.

We have recently become accustomed to lengthy, often unconstructive debate, mass meetings, disputes, and the unnecessary passions arising therefrom. Many clamorous slogans and resolutions of a general nature were also adopted following the 27th CPSU Congress, and there has been much talk and discussion at the congresses of USSR people's deputies. But has our life become any better as a result of these lengthy discussions? I cannot for this reason agree with a delegate who expressed the idea that the congress should call a break and assemble a month hence. Without losing costly time, let us accept the documents submitted to the congress and, coming together, let us get down to work. At the time of a recent poll, the Alitus people wanted the delegates to adopt a clear-cut position, be unanimous and adopt reasonable decisions, and not distance themselves from the people of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian Communist Party's ties to the CPSU should be based on equal cooperation. I support the proposition of the report of respected A. Brazauskas that speaking of a total severance of relations in this crucial period would be imprudent.

The party's draft action program requires the most discussion, perhaps, for this is the cornerstone. First of all, it should be more concise and specific, and its goals more comprehensible and clear to all people, and they should correspond to the cherished aspirations and endeavors of the people. It is essential that the program abandon general propositions and wording of which people are sick, beginning with the customary verbs—to increase, support, guarantee, resolve, develop, and so forth.

I believe that this affords a reason once again for doubting our sincerity and serious intention of changing anything fundamentally. The draft is all-embracing and at the same time says nothing. It is important to a person how and where he will live tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, what he will eat, and what kind of clothes he will wear. Therefore we need primarily to discuss how to develop the republic's agriculture—the foundation of the economy—and anticipate what can be done within a year or two to ensure that the rural inhabitant feel himself to be the real master of the land. Only in this case might we hope for a further growth of agricultural output, and this means our food, raw material for industry, products for exchange, and so forth. There will, possibly, be those who will take issue with me, saying that this is not a party matter, but people will not understand and will not support any party that lacks a practicable economic program. There have been many

programs, and various ones at that, but we are still not living under communism. Nor, it seems, will we. This has happened, in my opinion, because we have lacked the mechanism for realizing them. True, we have tasted the fruit of mature and developed socialism, but have not, unfortunately, eaten our fill of it. A Chinese saying has it: It is a long road without a turn. This time we have come to the most difficult stretch of the road, and for this reason we need to step boldly, supporting one another, for, stumbling on this road, we will come to nothing.

What alternatives of the republic's development do the various specific aims of Lithuania's communists define and which lead to our debate? This was mentioned in the speech by Artashes Gazaryan, deputy chief of the LiSSR State Committee for Statistics, Klaypeda Statistical Department. Is it possible to switch to a discussion thereof directly? Not yet. We are dealing with quite vague alternatives attended by a great degree of uncertainty as to future circumstances within and beyond our control. There is risk, whichever version we opt for. In addition, a specific goal is never chosen separately from the path of its achievement. Making an absolute of the goal is dangerous for self-organizing systems, of those such as society particularly. The most recent example is communism, which was set as a goal. And we have for decades been running in place at an impasse, lacking the opportunity to turn off from the "truly socialist path" onto the path of natural economic development that leads far more rapidly to the necessary result. Why has Sweden built socialism sooner than us? Because it has not been building communism.

But, in any event, before arguing about the party's aims and the paths of formation of the republic, it is necessary to answer an organizational question: Who will make the decision as to how the republic will live and which path it will take? There is no doubt that this will be done by the people via parliament, via the Supreme Soviet, and a referendum. No one has the right to interfere in their affairs, the communists of other republics included. Having set as the goal the exclusion of the command-administrative influence of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the behavior of Lithuanian citizens (members of the CPSU), we inevitably arrive at the idea of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. There will be no disjunction from the communists of other republics in the sense of a severance of the direct ties that have taken shape. It is a question of a severance of the relations of administrative subordination to the Central Committee Politburo.

Many people are annoyed that we are raising this issue precisely at this time, when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is in office and when we all understand the need to support him. Truly, Gorbachev is not Stalin, but excuse me, Comrade Slyunkov, nor is he Bukharin. The situation is such that we cannot risk it. Are there many in the hall willing to bear the moral responsibility for some routine CPSU Central Committee statement that will in the future cost us? I personally am not.

There are ambiguous situations partially because in preparation for the congress the program documents attempted to preserve the old name (outward formal loyalty) and completely alter the intrinsic content, a change that had long been due. We first need to define ourselves, starting with the fundamentals—"The Communist Manifesto". Do we agree with such basic propositions: "Communists are part of the proletariat and workers parties," "the aim of the communists is the conquest of political power by the proletariat," and "the basic theoretical principle is an end to private property". If we agree with this, the propositions of the CPSU program should be discussed. It records that mature socialism has been built in the USSR, that all social rights and freedoms have been realized, that the dignity of the personality has been suffused with real content and that the next stage is the building of communism. If we disagree with the provisions, and I believe that the majority of both Russian speakers and Lithuanians disagrees, what, then, do we intend preserving, what kind of ideological unity, if there has long not been such? As far as the preservation of organizational unity is concerned, there can be no question of this, I believe, inasmuch as it would in that case be a question of violation of the republic constitution. And until our party has gone underground, it must operate within the bounds of the constitution.

Comparison—PRAVDA on Gorbachev-CPLi Meeting PM1301004990

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 13 January 1990 carries in its First Edition on page 2 a TASS report on Mikhail Gorbachev's 12 January meeting with members of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform). The PRAVDA item, entitled "Conversation Held," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Service report published on pages 60-61 of the 12 January "Soviet Union DAILY REPORT," revealing the following variation:

Page 61, first full paragraph, following last sentence, the PRAVDA version adds the names of the following CPSU Central Committee members who took part in the conversation: "V.V. Grigoryev, first secretary of Vitebsk Oblast party committee [obkom]; V.A. Kuptsov, first secretary of Vologda CPSU Obkom; and V.G. Kolesnikov, USSR electronics industry minister."

Economic

Panel Discusses Unemployment, Wage Indexing PM1001153790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 2

[IZVESTIYA economic observer V. Romanyuk report under the rubric "Details and Commentaries": "Protection Against Inflation"]

[Text] The last issue of IZVESTIYA carried a report on a session of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and USSR Academy of Sciences joint scientific council. The session discussed two topical problems: the index-linking of the population's income and the concept of the law on employment.

We will begin with the second problem: It has now become particularly acute. And the newness of it all! Outlining the draft as a whole, V. Kolosov, chief of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Labor Resources and Employment Administration, said that, according to expert assessments, "forced unemployment" in the country has now reached 5 to 6 million, including 1.5 to 2 million "temporarily unemployed." However you phrase it, it still amounts to the same thing: people without work. Should this be tolerated under socialism? Should the draft law enshrine the concept of unemployment or should it treat it as an exceptional, extremely undesirable phenomenon?

It must be admitted that the problem exists. A new situation has arisen in the employment sphere with the appearance of different forms of ownership: A surplus of labor resources has been revealed and the former guarantees of social protection are gone; and, in the conditions of new forms of economic management, even wages themselves are in question, which never happened during the period when wage-leveling reigned supreme. That is one aspect of the matter. The second aspect is that structural changes in the national economy, particularly in the fuel and energy complex along with the unprecedented curtailment of a considerable proportion of construction projects, are all making the unemployment problem worse.

During the restructuring of the wages system, 3 million people have been taken out of social production and another 700,000 have been removed in the course of scaling down the administrative apparatus. The proposed draft law on employment stresses that a citizen must be free in his choice of work and that labor must be prestigious in the eyes of society. But, following from this, it also recognizes the benefits of having an army of manpower in reserve, which will supposedly make it possible to introduce changes into the economy quickly and flexibly and train workers in the needed professions. The concept also allows for voluntary unemployment (provided there is a source of income).

A. Kotlyar, head of department at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Central Research Laboratory, strongly criticized the draft law on employment. In his opinion, the draft should reflect the attitude that unemployment is incompatible with socialism.

Of course, we cannot brush aside the real processes taking place in society, but deformations in socialist practice certainly do not presuppose a rejection of socialist values. A discussion on organizing a labor

market in the country has flared up again in this connection. Some say that this kind of market turns manpower into a commodity and leads to society being divided into those who own the means of production and those who have only their own manpower. Others adhere to the view that a labor market would give people freedom of choice in the form of economic management adopted—state, cooperative, or leasehold—and in the type of work in general.

The discussion concerning the problems of index-linking the population's income was no less pointed. Opening the discussion, Academician T. Zaslavskaya formulated the question as follows: Just how prepared are we to introduce an index-linked standard of living and in what form should it be implemented? T. Yarygina, head of the Labor Research Institute Standard of Living Department, delivered a report. The aim of index-linking, she said, is to guarantee and maintain the population's real monetary income at the level of the social guarantees laid down by the state. The burden of the present situation is felt by everyone: We are faced, on the one hand, with rising prices and the depreciation of our monetary income, and, on the other, with an absence of social guarantees. Distribution relations in the country are out of touch with the standard of living, and the question of a subsistence minimum is still open.

The discussion revealed differences of opinion on the question of what exactly should be index-linked in an attempt to regulate more reliably the population's monetary income and more closely link the index-linking mechanism to state social policy. S. Shkurko, director of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Scientific Center, remarked in this connection that index-linking could only be successful under the conditions afforded by a stable economy. In any case, it should begin with the low-income groups. There are 45 million people in the country with an income of less than R70, and it is they more than any other strata of the population who suffer from inflationary processes.

Doubts also were expressed as to whether it is really possible in principle to index-link the population's monetary income in the present situation of a volatile market. Would this not be premature? V. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, however, expressed the belief that this is the right time to raise the question of index-linking. Social justice certainly does not consist in dividing everything equally but in reliably protecting the socially weak strata of the population even in the present confusion. Index-linking is not compensation, it is merely a means of protection against inflation. But not for everyone! As far as the active members of the population are concerned, they are perfectly capable of compensating the rising cost of living by producing more work of better quality.

Switch to Convertible Currency Assessed

904A0114A Moscow TRUD in Russian
3 Jan 90 p 3

[Article by S. Lykov, candidate of economic sciences: "The Laws of the Market Dictate"]

[Text] The last congress of people's deputies instructed the USSR Council of Ministers, beginning in 1991, to implement a phased switch of foreign economic ties with socialist countries to conditions of world prices and accounting in a freely convertible currency. What does this mean in practice, and what will it give our country and the socialist community?

At first we will try to analyze the existing system of foreign economic cooperation within the scope of CEMA [Council for Economic Mutual Assistance]. It rests basically on those three powerful pillars on which the internal national economic mechanisms of the socialist countries rested so peacefully until recently.

First and foremost, of course, is the plan, which is joined so well to the administrative-command method of management. In the foreign economic sphere, it is placed on the pedestal of intergovernmental agreements. The adoption of decisions and the responsibility for their implementation continue to remain principally with the center. The role of the lower elements—enterprises and organizations, that is, all of those who know immediately and, very likely, better than anyone else, what, where, and how much has to be paid for what is bought—is still extremely small. Decisions made by the government in recent years on expanding the independence of enterprises could not change the state of affairs radically. They did not eliminate the main thing—the dominating role of interstate agreements.

Second, it is "our own" special prices. Asserting that the internal trade turnover between the socialist countries is a part of overall world trade, we still apply the kinds of prices that no one else in the world has. A special methodology was invented to determine them, the essence of which lies in an accounting miscalculation of corresponding world prices for the previous five-year period. Such prices seemingly make it possible to protect our trade from the damaging influence from the "street," that is to say, the spontaneous fluctuations on world markets. However, they do not protect against what is most dangerous of all—against making wrong decisions. Such prices do not give the producers an opportunity to spot new trends in world economic developments in a timely way. They do not force the "muscles" of the producers of our country to always remain in good shape and be ready for retaliatory action to "attacks" by the world market.

Finally, the third pillar is the closed system of accounting, which has no outlet beyond CEMA boundaries. Its creation objectively reflected the attempts by our former leadership to reliably fence off and isolate the lovingly nurtured child of a centralized economy from

the severe winds of the world market. Such a system responded very well to the needs of the existing mechanism of foreign trade, because the commodity exchange took place on a bilateral, rigidly centralized basis and strictly within the framework of lists of commodities that were specified earlier in intergovernmental agreements.

This kind of a system does not require a full-value currency, but only an accounting unit by which the prices of commodities could be expressed and calculations of accomplished deliveries could be made. The transferable ruble, about which so many unflattering words were said recently in the pages of our press, became such an accounting unit. Nevertheless, the role of the transferable ruble can more easily be defined as an unwilling participant than the real guilty party in hindering cooperation within the framework of CEMA.

The reforms of the economic mechanisms that have started in the socialist countries and that are directed at the introduction of market methods of regulating the economy have placed completely new tasks before the foreign sphere. The logic of perestroika requires the direct movement of the commodity producers into the first ranks of the rulers of the destiny of cooperation. Their initiative and interests must determine the forms and directions of the development of foreign economic ties. For this, the enterprises need real independence and the ability to orient themselves freely not only in the internal CEMA market, but in the international market as well.

The adoption by the Congress of People's Deputies of the phased shift, in cooperation with the socialist countries, to the use of world prices and calculations in a freely convertible currency provides the foundation for precisely such a movement forward. It will make it possible to improve foreign economic relations with the socialist countries and bring their conditions closer to general world practice. It also will help to speed up the inclusion of the national economic mechanisms of our countries in the common system of the world economy and in the all-European process of integration.

Specifically, this step should put all participants in foreign economic activity on equal terms, regardless of whether their trading partners are from capitalist or socialist countries. When you sell a product, you receive freely convertible currency. Having the currency, you can choose who offers you the best commodity and under what conditions. Moreover, you do not have to recalculate the prices. The prices are the same—those that the world market dictates. Of course, in such a system no one will ever again buy unmarketable, low quality commodities. And if such products are bought, they will be purchased at a much lower and, perhaps, dumping price. If the price does not please the seller, well, so what? Another partner can be found on the world market.

The inculcation of such a system will require the introduction of a whole range of changes in the operating

mechanism of cooperation. If we do not reject the strict concentration and the acceptance of absolute interstate obligations for mutual deliveries of commodities, then the new system will be unworkable. The governments of the countries will be forced, in fulfillment of assumed obligations, to use the directive method to compel economic organizations to conclude transactions under conditions that are even unfavorable to themselves.

Adjustments will have to be made in our internal mechanism as well. In particular, the planned tasks of Soviet enterprises for export and import of commodities in the CEMA countries will have to be included in the overall export and import plan in a freely convertible currency without a breakdown by individual countries. In doing this, it will be necessary aggressively and consistently to put into practice a policy of direct material responsibility and interest of enterprises in their foreign trade activity, rejecting methods in which the state budget fully covers additional currency losses from import because of increased prices.

There is much work to be done here. To implement all of the changes simultaneously with all countries under conditions when, frankly, the employment of market mechanisms is just beginning, is extremely difficult. Additional difficulties are caused by the very serious currency and financial position of practically all socialist countries and by a severe shortage of freely convertible currency in those countries. Therefore, it is planned to introduce the new mechanism in phases, taking into account the results of the economic reforms taking place. Another issue is important: A decisive step has been taken in the direction of creating an integrated model of foreign economic cooperation that is based on a principally new foundation of market relations.

In the future, to the extent of development in individual countries of internal markets and the decentralization of the forms of international trade, in the process of forming a united CEMA market, the new system of calculations, aside from the freely convertible currencies of the capitalist countries, can also include the currencies of the socialist countries to, of course, the extent of their convertibility.

With the development of market relations, an objective necessity might also arise in the future to recreate the collective currency of the CEMA countries on a principally new basis, on conditions of its convertibility into freely convertible currency and national currencies of the CEMA member countries. But this is in the future.

Leningrad Institute Taps Foreign Expertise

*PM1601123790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[Report by Candidate of Economic Sciences I. Lavrovskiy under the rubric "Details and Commentaries": "Foreign Economists Offer Suggestions"]

[Text] Well-known U.S. scientist and Nobel Prize winner Prof Wassily Leontief and other leading Western economists have offered their recommendations for possible ways to stabilize the Soviet economy.

"Restructuring and the Soviet Economy" was the topic of an international conference organized by the Leningrad International Management Institute. A number of well-known Soviet and foreign scientists took part and discussed important problems connected with the reform of the Soviet economy.

The word "market" is used these days like the words "Open, Sesame!" But, as Prof W. Leontief warned in an address to the conference, it is quite possible to have a market economy in which everyone covers his own expenditure but no one wants to work hard and earn a lot of money. In that case, no major improvements should be counted on. Sesame will not open.

Another conference participant, OECD adviser S. Zecini, expressed the idea that a regulated market economy could incorporate not only the advantages but also the shortcomings of the two systems. After all, competition is not effective if it is dishonest and if the state, as is the custom here, plays on the side of one of the teams.

Yes, the state does regulate the market in the West. But freedom of trade and enterprise is the cornerstone of the classic European economy. The state protects this freedom against monopolies and promotes free, informed consumer choice. If, on the other hand, this freedom is recognized only with certain conditions attached, as a forced addition to an overall lack of freedom, we end up with a surrogate that will not produce the expected result.

Consequently, it is time we decided what we want: an efficient economy, or a collection of slogans concealing the futility of the command system. Otherwise, we are inevitably going to find ourselves in a difficult situation, trying to cure the shortcomings of "developed socialism" using the "advantages of socialism."

If we are talking about ownership, it is also very important to change the essence of the situation and not simply the legal form. W. Leontief said, with good reason, that state ownership can work just as well as private ownership. The extremely successful West German "Volkswagen" concern, for example, belongs to the state. In Italy, approximately half of all industry is state-owned. And in other Western countries, including France and Britain, successes in the state sector are not rare.

No one can solve our problems but ourselves. Virtually all the conference participants agreed on this, just as they agreed that this cannot possibly be done without bringing in foreign specialists to resolve our acute problems.

Consequently, it is hard to overestimate the contribution made by the Leningrad International Management Institute's initiative—namely, to gather Soviet and foreign

economists and business people together to try to find a common language and overcome the "nonconvertibility of ideas." International contacts, joint projects, and new openness in the sphere of economic ideology and economic practice are as vital to us as the air we breathe. This is the only way we are going to be able to liberate our way of thinking and find real ways to overcome the crisis.

Meetings of this kind must be held regularly. Along these lines, K. Boehme from the FRG Economics Ministry said that in his country such conferences involving statesmen, economists, and businessmen are held every 3 or 4 months to discuss what is happening with currency convertibility or what has been happening in the market of this or that country. Various economic methods and approaches are patiently explained. Ideas are one step ahead of actions, rather than dragging behind them.

This is even more important for us than for the FRG. We can hardly fail to sit up and take note when specialists like W. Leontief propose to "help the Soviets, suggest conditions under which the economic system will work efficiently, and organize joint enterprises. The Leningrad International Management Institute is one such joint enterprise whose work could become part of the plan for cooperation between us. This could have great significance."

Scientific

Ulyanovsk Radar To Be Moved for Health Reasons

LD1601224890 Moscow World Service in English
2200 GMT 16 Jan 90

[Text] A powerful radar station in Ulyanovsk on the Volga will be speedily moved out of town. The decision was made at the requirement of the local party and government bodies. The radar creates a powerful electromagnetic field harming the health of the townspeople.

Nuclear Power Station Incident Figures for Dec

PM1201155690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Yu. Rogozhin report, incorporating interview with N. Shteynberg, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry: "Incidents at Nuclear Power Stations in December 1989: USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry Continues To Report on Incidents at Nuclear Power Stations"]

[Text] In December 1989 there were 46 power units in operation. The statistics for unplanned reductions in capacity and stoppages look like this:

Nuclear Power Station [AES]	Reduction in Capacity	Stoppages	Total Capacity
-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------	----------------

		Human Error	Equipment Failure	
Zaporozhye AES	0	1	1	2
Novovoronezh AES	0	1	1	2
Chernobyl AES	2	1	0	1
Rovno AES	0	1	0	1
South Ukrainian AES	0	1	0	1
Ignalina AES	1	0	0	0
Total:	3	5	2	7

There were no violations of operational safety limits. The radiation situation at the power stations and in the monitored zones did not exceed overall the limits set for normal operation. There was no excess of irradiation of personnel.

N. Shteynberg, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry, answers our correspondent's questions.

[Rogozhin] Nikolay Aleksandrovich, the report notes incidents leading to a stoppage or reduction of capacity at nuclear power units. However, there are also other facilities on the grounds of nuclear power stations where an accident could lead to radioactive contamination of the environment. Were there any such accidents at such facilities last month, or earlier?

[Shteynberg] As I understand it, you are talking about storage facilities for liquid and solid radioactive waste and storage facilities for spent nuclear fuel. These facilities are also under our committee's supervision. Recently there have been no accidents or other events of importance in terms of safety there. True, there was a small leak of radioactive water from a container for the transportation of spent fuel at the Kursk AES. This fact was noted in a report of AES incidents previously published in IZVESTIYA. We intend to continue to inform readers of all incidents that exacerbate the radiation situation, wherever they may occur.

[Prozhogin] The reports of the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry do not mention instances of injury to personnel at nuclear power stations. Tell me, have there been none, or is this sphere of the AES's life not under the committee's supervision?

[Shteynberg] Indeed, questions of injury and work safety at AES's were not within our jurisdiction until recently. But of course, we showed an interest in this. And I can therefore tell you that the level of injuries in the nuclear power industry is considerably lower than in other fuel and power sectors. This is because of the relatively higher standard of production work and personnel skills. From 1990, in connection with the amalgamation of the State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision and the State

Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in the Atomic Power Industry to form a single structure—the USSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry—questions of work safety at AES's fall within the sphere of our committee's interests.

[Rogozhin] Power units of the first generation, of an obsolete design, are among those now in operation. Judging by today's report, they do not particularly stand out from the others. Does this mean that their safety levels meet today's demands?

[Shteynberg] Enterprises built in various years are operating within the structure of the country's nuclear power industry. Some of the power units erected in the sixties and seventies are not up to present-day AES safety requirements. I am referring to the first generation of RBMK-1000 power units (the so-called "Chernobyl type") and the VVER-440. A number of measures have been carried out at the RBMK's to rule out the possibility of repetition of accidents on the Chernobyl scale. However, it must be said frankly that in this case too the safety level of the reactors in question is not fully in accordance with today's increased requirements.

The substantial shortcomings of the first-generation VVER-440 power units center on the lack of a containment structure to contain possible accidents and the relatively "weak" safety systems. Despite these features, the first-generation power units are still operating reliably enough today. Nonetheless, some of the obsolete units already have been decommissioned. The fate of the others will be decided as soon as possible.

Cosmonauts Mark 130 Days Aboard Mir

LD1601125790 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT
16 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS—The TASS correspondent reports from mission control centre: Alexmnder Viktorenko and Alexander Serebrov have now spent 130 days aboard the Mir orbital complex. Following the completion of operations related to the spacewalk, they continued to fulfil the flight programme.

They performed a new experiment in space materials studies on the Gallar installation. Its purpose was to grow the monocrystal of gallium arsenide using the method of oriented crystallisation.

Under the schedule of checking and maintenance work, the cosmonauts replaced a set of hydraulic pumps in the station's thermoregulation system.

Today the crew is engaged mostly in re-activating a sanitary and hygienic support system in the Kvant-2 service module. In the evening they plan to correct the complex's orbit by using the tanker transport vehicle's engines.

According to telemetry and reports from orbit, the flight is proceeding normally. Both cosmonauts are in good health and feel well.

Mortars Used for Seismic Experiments

PM1201101790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Prospecting by... Mortar"]

[Text] Perm, 10 Jan—A rumor flew round the city: They are shooting the other side of the river! And it was true that shots were ringing out one after another in the taiga. An experienced military man could have made out at once that they were firing from a large mortar.

Indeed, a mortar winched down from a special truck was resting on a powerful base plate in a forest clearing. But its crew consisted of men in civilian clothing: L. Orlov, chief engineer of the "Permneftegeofizika" association; I. Filimonov, leading design engineer at the Lyubertsy "Soyuz" scientific production association; V. Prikhodchenko, deputy director of the Perm "Temp" experimental design bureau; and V. Shusterman, chief of a department of the experimental design bureau.

Oil and gas workers have long used "demobilized" military equipment. For instance, 100 mm guns bore holes for field research and drive tie rods into the ground, using them to reliably secure gas pipelines. Now the mortar also has mastered a civilian profession.

"Military equipment released during the reduction of the country's armed forces also can work in seismic prospecting," says L. Orlov. "We have tried simply to shoot from a mortar instead of drilling a hole and detonating a charge in it. The Perm geophysicists together with the Lyubertsy designers have calculated the force of the charge anew. Expectations were confirmed: A shot shows up on instruments as a series of transverse waves which we could previously generate in the earth's crust only by an underground explosion."

The mortar was prepared for "battle" again. But it was charged not with explosives but with water. A volley—and a fountain erupted over the fir trees while new data appeared on the instruments. The tests were completed. The conclusion of the interdepartmental commission was that the mortar was fulfilling its task perfectly. The first "battery" can be sent to a seismic prospecting party.

Military

Moscow MD Communists Draft Election Platform

PM1101152790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 11 Jan 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Lieutenant General A. Makunin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Moscow Military District Political Directorate, by stringer Colonel of the Reserve F. Semyanovskiy under the

rubric "We Are Preparing for the Elections": "Communists Define Their Position"; date and place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The "Theses for the Political Platform for Political Organs and Party Organizations in the Forthcoming Elections of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies and Local Soviets" have been drafted and published in Moscow Military District. In connection with this, our stringer—Col. of the Reserve F. Semyanovskiy—put a few questions to Lt. Gen. A. Makunin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Moscow Military District Political Directorate.

[Semyanovskiy] Anatoliy Ivanovich, in their election work the country's Communists are relying on the CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the Soviet people. This is a kind of party platform which has won society's support. What prompted the Communists of the Moscow Military District to draw up their own political platform?

[Makunin] I would stress above all that our platform wholly shares the CPSU position. The district's troops are located in 18 Russian oblasts. The election campaign is currently under way there. The most varied unofficial organizations are actively involved in it: people's fronts, movements, associations, clubs, foundations, and so forth. It's hard for voters to get a handle on their sometimes contradictory positions, and we should clearly express our attitude to this—all the more so, since the new recruits to the district's troops are young people with different social and moral precepts. Moreover, they will all be taking part in the elections and determining the destiny of various candidate deputies. We need to help them to make up their minds.

[Semyanovskiy] Could you say what "techniques"—if I may put it that way—were used in preparing the platform?

[Makunin] Above all, we analyzed the results of the elections of USSR people's deputies. A substantial contribution to the elaboration of the platform also was made by servicemen deputies working in the current soviets. There were more than 1,000 such deputies in the district. They can not only see the acute problems in voters' lives but can solve them, which helped us place the necessary emphasis in the platform.

There is one other channel through which we receive opinions, proposals, and judgments. A rally of combat mentors was recently held in the district. The rally participants—soldiers and sergeants—were sent to the cities and oblasts from which they hail. They were instructed to speak at enterprises, schools, secondary vocational and technical schools, technical colleges, apartment blocks, and houses of culture and to listen to their countrymen. More than 139,000 people took part in these meetings. Here is an example. Guards Private A. Kuznetsov, a native of Gorkiy Oblast, was ordered back to his native area. The soldier not only talked about his career and that of his comrades but also listened to what

his countrymen had to say about their problems. On returning to the unit, Kuznetsov talked about the meetings.

The platform also included remarks and proposals from individual Communists which were heard at meetings and in conversations with the district leadership and officials of the Political Directorate.

[Semyanovskiy] As is well known, the election has already picked up speed. Could you mention some of the first practical steps in implementing the platform?

[Makunin] I think so. For instance, a meeting of officers at the Guards Motorized Rifle Brigade, which marked the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, sharply voiced people's demand for extensive glasnost in resolving housing questions, in nominating officers for promotion, in awarding military ranks, in putting people forward for state awards, and so forth. Guards Colonel B. Polyakov, commander of the brigade, and political workers Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Skalskiy, Majors V. Bazhenov, V. Karpushkin, and others, and the secretaries of party organizations carefully analyzed these proposals, and most of them have now been implemented.